

Will L. Lowrie to be consul general.
Alexander W. Weddell to be consul general.
Alfred A. Winslow to be consul general.
Edward D. Winslow to be consul general.

CONSULS.

CLASS 2.

Ross E. Holaday to be consul.

CLASS 3.

Frank W. Mahin to be consul.

CLASS 4.

P. Merrill Griffith to be consul.

CLASS 5.

Arminius T. Haeberle to be consul.
Michael J. Hendrick to be consul.
Calvin Milton Hitch to be consul.

CLASS 6.

Marion Letcher to be consul.
Stuart K. Lupton to be consul.
Frederick Simpich to be consul.

CLASS 7.

Clarence Carrigan to be consul.
George C. Cole to be consul.
Henry C. A. Damm to be consul.
Alfred W. Donegan to be consul.
Claude E. Guyant to be consul.
Perry C. Hays to be consul.
William J. Yerby to be consul.

CLASS 8.

Oscar S. Helzer to be consul.
Theodore Jaeckel to be consul.

CLASS 9.

Thomas D. Davis to be consul.
Maurice P. Dunlap to be consul.
John R. Silliman to be consul.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Harland B. Howe to be United States district judge for the district of Vermont.

MARSHAL OF THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA.

Paul McRae, of Virginia, to be marshal of the United States Court for China.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

Second Lieut. of Engineers Jesse Wilbur Glover to be first lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Francis Clare Allen to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Charles Herman Johnson to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Clinton Philo Kendall to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Kurt Wolfgang Krafft to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Charles Joseph Odend'hal to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Herbert Norton Perham to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Henry Charles Roach to be second lieutenant of engineers.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD.

George Wheeler Bowley to be district superintendent.
Edgar Chadwick to be district superintendent.
Edwin Emmet Chapman to be district superintendent.
John Stites Cole to be district superintendent.
Arthur Dominy to be district superintendent.
Silas Hatch Harding to be district superintendent.
Jerome Godfrey Klah to be district superintendent.
Herbert Minot Knowles to be district superintendent.
Gus Brynolf Lofberg to be district superintendent.
Patrick Henry Morgan to be district superintendent.
James Franklin Phillips to be district superintendent.
William Edward Tunnell to be district superintendent.
Otto Gabriel Wellander to be district superintendent.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW YORK.

Charles F. Bergner, Callicoon.
Sidney R. Hooker, Angelica.
Jesse Jacobs, Oxford.
James H. Joy, Fort Ann.
Francis Larkin, Ossining.

Michael J. Manton, Sayville.
David J. McHenry, Granville.
John A. Neafsey, Glen Cove.
W. W. O'Connor, Fort Plain.
Michael J. Spillane, East Syracuse.
Asher C. Stafford, Gowanda.
Maynard A. Thompson, Waverly.
John G. Gibson, Utica.

OHIO.

Welker Besst, West Lafayette.
George O. Canaga, Scio.
Ira A. Deeter, Pleasant Hill.
Charles J. Kessler, New Lexington.
Frank J. Mitchell, Port Clinton.
William P. Moore, Adena.
George F. Parrish, Toledo.
Charles F. Vollmer, Bucyrus.

OKLAHOMA.

Claude Weaver, Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James W. Aikin, Christiana.
Thomas A. Derick, Newville.
Daniel R. Dunkel, Hamburg.
Albert E. Eckert, East Stroudsburg.
Dwight M. Hess, Hellwood.
Harry R. Schneitman, Elizabethtown.
George D. Schoenly, Boyertown.
John W. Warehime, Waynesboro.
Adam Wise, Gap.
Clarence H. Young, Manheim.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John Haynes, Hinton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 22, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for all the disclosures Thou hast made of Thyself in the material universe, in the written word, in the great men whom Thou hast raised up from time to time, who have left the impress of their characters on their respective ages, and by their deeds advanced the conditions of mankind. Our thoughts turn to-day to our revered Washington, whom we rightly call the "Father of his Country." For in its sacred institutions, its genius, he lives, a beacon light to guide the ship of state ever onward to the betterment of humanity. We thank Thee for what he was, for what he did, for the inspiration which impels to citizenship, patriotic zeal, and Christian manhood. Not only the American people but the liberty-loving people round the world will celebrate in song and story his birth, life, and deeds as a patriot, soldier, statesman. Help us to follow his illustrious example and emulate his virtues; and Thine be the praise, in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 20, and of Sunday, February 21, 1915, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19909. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7362. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept relinquishment from the State of Utah of certain other lands in lieu thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 21318. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the two appropriation bills just reported back from the Senate.

Mr. MANN. There are no points of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not the time for reservation of points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves all points of order on the two appropriation bills just sent over from the Senate.

JOSEPH ELIOT AUSTIN.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy, to which there is a Senate amendment; and I ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to take this bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I should like two or three minutes on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy. The bill was introduced in the House on April 14, 1913, and reported to the House on July 9, 1914. The report to the House did not show that the bill had been referred to the Secretary of the Navy for information or suggestions, although the committee had in its files a letter from the Secretary of the Navy dated December 18, 1913, not only opposing the passage of the bill, but giving rather detailed information concerning it and suggesting that if it were passed a certain amendment ought to be agreed to.

I do not think it is quite fair to the House for one of the committees of the House to have information of this character and suppress it when reporting a bill to the House. It seems to me that when one of the committees refers a bill to a department for information and obtains information from the department, in justice to the House that information ought to be reported to the House instead of being allowed to sleep quietly in one of the pigeonholes of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to state that I have never seen the report of the committee. I designated one of the members of the committee to report the bill, and he prepared the report. I do not know what is in it or what is left out of it. So that I have no information whatever as to the matter about which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. MANN. I do not know who actually prepared the report, whether it was the clerk of the committee or a member of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know myself. I have never seen the report.

Mr. MANN. However that may be, there was information from the Navy Department giving quite a full statement of facts in reference to this matter. The House was informed of facts in direct conflict with the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, without any reference to the letter which the Secretary of the Navy had sent to the committee reporting upon this bill. If the Committee on Naval Affairs or other committees desire to stand in good odor in the House, when they have information reported to them officially from the department they ought to furnish that information to the House instead of concealing it. It never would have been known in the House that there was such a letter if it had not been for the action of the Senate. The Senate committee printed the letter in their report and acted upon it, but the letter from the Secretary to the committee of the House was printed by the Senate instead of being furnished to the House by the House committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WITHERSPOON, Mr. TRIBBLE, and Mr. BUTLER.

PROPOSED EVENING SESSION ON WEDNESDAY.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the House take a recess at not later than 5.30 p. m. until 8 p. m., and that there be a meeting of the House at 8 o'clock to continue not later than 11.30 p. m. for consideration of bills on the Private Calendar which are not objected to, and also for the consideration of bills which have been amended in the Senate, after having been passed by the House by unanimous consent at these night meetings. I ask that the bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

I would like to say that there is a part of the Private Calendar that has never been called at all, and at that meeting I shall ask that the calendar be first completed, so that every bill on the calendar have an opportunity to be considered by unanimous con-

sent one time. After the calendar is completed I will ask that the bills which have been amended by the Senate be taken up, after which the entire Private Calendar be taken up. That will give a chance to go over it again and take up such bills as are not objected to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I did not hear the first part of his request. There is a bill on the Private Calendar reported from the Committee on War Claims which is unfinished business. Is this limited only to claims or does it embrace war claims?

Mr. POU. The entire Private Calendar.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. There is a bill that was reported from the Committee on War Claims that is the unfinished business. Would that be unfinished business on the calendar, first to be taken up and disposed of?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman sure of his facts?

Mr. PADGETT. It is the case of Cheairs.

Mr. MANN. Is not that bill still pending in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And not reported?

Mr. PADGETT. It has not been reported by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think it is quite fair to the membership of the House to stay in session from 11 o'clock in the morning and continue in session until 11.30 o'clock at night for the consideration of these bills. I think it would not be objectionable—at least it would not from my standpoint—if the gentleman should make it from 8 o'clock until 10.30 o'clock at night, but to stay until 11.30 o'clock at night is an undue punishment.

Mr. POU. I said, not later than 11.30 o'clock.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think if the gentleman will put the limit at 10.30 o'clock we would be doing a very good day's work.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman change his request to 10.30 o'clock?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield to me for a minute. This private calendar has not been called at all at this session, and a good many gentlemen are interested in having it called, and if they are willing to stay it seems to me that they ought to have the opportunity. We have had to stay on other matters that long.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will inform the gentleman that only a very few bills on the calendar have not had their day in court. We virtually completed the calendar at the last session when we ran until 11.30 o'clock at night. There were only a handful of Members present at that hour. They were very tired, and I think it is consistent with fair consideration of the bill that Members should not be asked to stay until they become fatigued.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman is right, there will not be a very late session.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not understand the proposal, because we could not take up the bills that are objected to.

The SPEAKER. Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee, it seems to the Chair that that is the first bill to be taken up.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, of course the only opportunity to consider any of these bills will be by unanimous consent, and the only chance to get a night session is by unanimous consent. I will amend the request and make it 11 o'clock, and I hope the gentleman will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on next Wednesday at 5.30 o'clock the House shall stand in recess until 8 o'clock p. m., and have a night session to extend not later than 11 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar that are not objected to, and that the bills shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows that next Wednesday is not Calendar Wednesday, and that the House may be engaged in the consideration of an appropriation bill, not only may be but probably will be, and very likely will want to stay late if Members are willing to stay here in the consideration of appropriation bills. When the gentleman had the night session before it was Calendar Wednesday, a day when they could not consider the appropriation bills. Next Wednesday is not Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. POU. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MANN. I suggest that we do not have that meeting that night, and I object.

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman object to Thursday night?

Mr. MANN. I object to any night at all until we know what we have done with the appropriation bills. I think it is much more important that we finish the business of this session and not have an extra session than it is to pass a few private bills which have no chance of being passed in the Senate in any event.

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman object to to-night? There are a good many gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber who have asked me to make this request.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] does not object, I do not know what I would do. I should hope that he would object to that.

Mr. POU. It is the last chance the Private Calendar is going to have, in all probability.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the House bills on the Private Calendar that have been passed now have not very much chance of being considered in the Senate.

Mr. POU. They have some chance.

Mr. MANN. The Senate can not pass one-quarter of the bills that we have sent over to them.

Mr. POU. I will say this, that there are quite a number of bills that have been amended by the Senate, and we want to dispose of those bills first. I suppose there have been a score of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who have asked that this request be made, and I make it. That is all I can do.

Mr. MANN. I should think most of the House bills with Senate amendments might easily be disposed of without having a night session. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is District day, and I hope that that motion will not prevail.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were—ayes 66, noes 35.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 179, nays 101, answered "present" 2, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 84.]

YEAS—179.

Adair	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Raker
Allen	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Rauch
Anderson	FitzHenry	Konop	Reed
Ashbrook	Fordney	La Follette	Reilly, Wis.
Austin	Foster	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Bailey	Frear	Leshner	Rogers
Baker	Gard	Lieb	Rubey
Baltz	Gardner	Lindbergh	Rucker
Bathrick	Gerry	Lloyd	Russell
Beakes	Gillett	Lobeck	Scott
Boober	Gilmore	Logue	Shackleford
Borchers	Goeke	Loneragan	Sherley
Bowdle	Good	McAndrews	Sherwood
Britten	Goulden	McKenzie	Shreve
Brown, N. Y.	Gray	Madden	Sinnott
Brown, W. Va.	Greene, Mass.	Maguire, Nebr.	Slemp
Brumbaugh	Guernsey	Manahan	Sloan
Buchanan, Ill.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Bulkley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamlin	Miller	Stafford
Burke, Wis.	Hart	Mitchell	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Haugen	Mondell	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Hawley	Moore	Stevens, N. H.
Callaway	Hayden	Morgan, Okla.	Stone
Campbell	Hayes	Morrison	Stout
Casey	Helgesen	Moss, Ind.	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Helvering	Moss, W. Va.	Sutherland
Clancy	Hill	Mulkey	Switzer
Cline	Hinds	Murdock	Taggart
Connelly, Kans.	Hinebaugh	Neeley, Kans.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cooper	Howell	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Cox	Hughes, W. Va.	Nelson	Temple
Cramton	Hullings	Nolan, J. I.	Ten Eyck
Cullop	Humphrey, Wash.	Norton	Thacher
Danforth	Igoe	Padgett	Thomson, Ill.
Davis	Johnson, Utah	Palmer	Towner
Dershem	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Underwood
Dickinson	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Dillon	Keating	Patten, N. Y.	Walsh
Dixon	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Doolittle	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	White
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan	Williams
Esch	Kent	Platt	Winslow
Evans	Key, Ohio	Post	Young, N. Dak.
Falconer	Kinkaid	Powers	

NAYS—101.

Abercrombie	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Smith, Md.
Adamson	Dupré	Hull	Smith, Tex.
Aiken	Eagle	Humphreys, Miss.	Sparkman
Aswell	Edwards	Jacoway	Stanley
Barkley	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Stedman
Bartlett	Fields	Johnson, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Barton	Finley	Kitchin	Stephens, Tex.
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Lafferty	Sumners
Bell, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Lazaro	Taylor, Ala.
Blackmon	Gallagher	Lee, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Borland	Garner	McKellar	Thomas
Brockson	Garrett, Tenn.	MacDonald	Thompson, Okla.
Broussard	Garrett, Tex.	Moon	Tribble
Buchanan, Tex.	Glass	Murray	Vaughan
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Oldfield	Vinson
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Page, N. C.	Watkins
Candler, Miss.	Gregg	Park	Watson
Caraway	Hardy	Pou	Weaver
Carlin	Harris	Quin	Webb
Church	Harrison	Rainey	Whaley
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Rayburn	Wingo
Collier	Helm	Rothermel	Witherspoon
Crisp	Henry	Rouse	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Holland	Saunders	
Dent	Houston	Sisson	
Dies	Howard	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Browning Hay

NOT VOTING—141.

Ainey	Drukker	Kiess, Pa.	Prouty
Alexander	Dunn	Kindel	Ragsdale
Anthony	Eagan	Korby	Reilly, Conn.
Avis	Edmonds	Kreider	Riordan
Barchfeld	Elder	Langham	Roberts, Nev.
Barnhart	Estopinal	Langley	Rupley
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Lee, Pa.	Sabath
Bell, Cal.	Faison	L'Engle	Scully
Brodbeck	Farr	Lever	Seldomridge
Browne, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Levy	Sells
Bruckner	Fowler	Lewis, Md.	Sims
Bryan	Francis	Lewis, Pa.	Slayden
Burgess	French	Lindquist	Smith, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Gallivan	Linthicum	Smith, N. Y.
Burnett	George	Loft	Smith, Saml. W.
Cantor	Gill	McClellan	Steenerson
Cantrill	Gittins	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Cal.
Carew	Goldfogle	McGuire, Okla.	Talbott, Md.
Carr	Gordon	McLaughlin	Tavener
Carter	Gorman	Mahan	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Maher	Townsend
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Treadway
Coady	Green, Iowa	Metz	Tuttle
Connolly, Iowa	Greene, Vt.	Montague	Underhill
Conry	Griest	Morgan, La.	Vare
Copley	Griffin	Morin	Vollmer
Crosser	Gudger	Mott	Walker
Curry	Hamill	O'Brien	Wallin
Dale	Hensley	Oglesby	Walters
Decker	Hobson	O'Hair	Wilson, Fla.
Deltrick	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Jones	Paige, Mass.	Woodruff
Donohoe	Keister	Peterson	Woods
Donovan	Kelly, Pa.	Plumley	
Dooling	Kennedy, Conn.	Porter	
Driscoll	Kettner	Price	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LOFT (for Sherley motion) with Mr. Wilson of Florida (against).

Mr. CANTOR (for Sherley motion) with Mr. WALKER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DALE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. COADY with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. CARY.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut with Mr. LINDQUIST.
 Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.
 Mr. McGILLICUDDY with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. PLUMLEY.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. PROUTY.
 Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. RUPLEY.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. PETERSON with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. WALLIN.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. STEPHENS of California.
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. STEENERSON.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. WOODRUFF.
 Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. WALTERS.

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a general pair with my colleague [Mr. SCULLY], who is absent. I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. BROWNING was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill, with Mr. HOUSTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been customary for several years past, upon the anniversary of the birthday of Washington to have read his Farewell Address. It is a custom that I am sure all feel should be continued, and I therefore take great pleasure in yielding 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] for the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. [Applause.]

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee read as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service, which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me

to abandon the idea. I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the Government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me, and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which, and unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guaranty of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which can not end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation and to recommend to your frequent review some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest

even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes in different ways to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations, and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular

districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You can not shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen in the negotiation by the Executive and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties—that with Great Britain and that with Spain—which secure to them everything they could desire in respect to our foreign relations toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community, and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans, digested by common counsels and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember especially that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable.

Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind—which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight—the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the Government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This, within certain limits, is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose; and there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections

with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives; but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object, which is always a choice of difficulties, ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the Government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct. And can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in the place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.

Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject. At other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often—sometimes, perhaps, the liberty—of nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the conces-

sions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens—the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it—for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place

itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good—that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated the public records and the other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined as far as should depend upon me to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence, and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love toward it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, 17th September, 1796.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time the gentleman consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty minutes have been consumed.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] use some of his time.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, to-day, the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, it seems appropriate to discuss questions vital to the general welfare of the people, in

which he was so deeply interested. It seems fitting to speak of policies of this Government affecting the prosperity of the country, and to discuss the wisdom of certain important legislation. I refer to recent legislation directly affecting the revenues of the Government and indirectly affecting American industry and labor and the happiness of the Nation. It is generally known that revenues at present are not sufficient to meet the running expenses of the Government and that the prosperity of the Nation is at ebb tide. What has brought all this about?

In beginning I wish to say to my Democratic friends that when you differ with me and my associates on this side of the House, the Republican Party, on this great question I wish to give to you credit for being honest and sincere in your belief. I know that I am sincere in mine. I know that other men who believe as I do are sincere in their belief. And with that statement I say that when we differ with you we differ with you in the policies advocated by your party.

On September 4, 1914, in this Chamber, the President of the United States, in a message to Congress urging the immediate enactment of the so-called war-tax measure, called attention to the fact that customs receipts for August, 1914, had fallen far short of customs receipts for the corresponding month one year previous, and said:

I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due, in chief part, not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations, and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe.

How much was this "great decrease in importations," to which the President refers? Our imports for August, 1913, amounted to \$137,600,000, and our imports for August, 1914, were \$129,700,000, or a loss of a little less than \$8,000,000, a falling off of 5.8 per cent. Now, let us see what we lost in customs receipts. In August, 1913, customs receipts amounted to \$30,930,000. In August, 1914, customs receipts were \$19,430,000, or a loss of \$11,500,000. In other words, the loss in customs receipts amounted to 37.2 per cent. Let me repeat, comparing August, 1913 (with a Republican tariff law in force) with August, 1914 (with a Democratic tariff law in force), we lost \$11,500,000 in customs receipts on a loss of imports amounting to less than \$8,000,000. Our total imports decreased 5.8 per cent, and our customs receipts fell off 37.2 per cent, yet our President would have us think this loss of revenue was due to the falling off in imports due "in chief part" to the war in Europe.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will, but I have such a limited time I would like if the gentleman would just ask a brief question.

Mr. GORDON. The question is this: Is it not a fact that the revenue-paying imports fell off in a very much greater percentage than those which paid no revenue?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think the gentleman is right. Under the present law our imports on the free list are 63 per cent. They were upward of 50 per cent under the Payne tariff law. Our total imports decreased 5.8, as I have said, and the customs receipts fell off 37.2. It is true that when wool and other farm products went on the free list under the terms of the Democratic tariff law, revenue-paying imports showed a decline, and when sugar goes on the free list in May, 1916, our revenue-producing imports will suffer an additional serious setback.

Under the Democratic tariff law the Government is collecting approximately 13.35 per cent ad valorem in customs duties on the total imports. A decrease of \$8,000,000 in importations at 13.35 per cent ad valorem should cause a loss in customs receipts of \$1,040,000; but we lost \$11,500,000. That loss in customs receipts was not due in chief part to a decrease in imports, as stated by the President. Such a contention is absurd. Ninety and four-tenths per cent of that loss in customs receipts was due to lower rates of duty, and but 9.6 per cent was due to the decrease in importations.

Some friends of the new tariff law have pointed to the customs receipts for the month of October, 1913, as evidence that the new law was an adequate revenue producer. That was the first month of the life of the Underwood tariff law and customs receipts amounted to a little over \$30,000,000. However, the reduced tariff rates on sugar did not go into operation for several months thereafter, and wool did not go on the free list until December, 1913; and the reduced rates of duty on woolen goods became effective January, 1914. Moreover, large quantities of goods imported before October were held in bond until after the new law went into effect and were released that month and duty was paid thereon. Our total imports for October, 1913, amounted to \$132,000,000.

In October, 1914—with the war raging in Europe—our imports amounted to \$138,000,000, or an actual gain in imports of

\$6,000,000. How about customs receipts? Comparing October, 1913, and October, 1914, imports increased, as before stated, \$6,000,000; but customs receipts showed a loss of \$14,000,000. Will anyone contend this loss in customs receipts was due in chief part to a decrease in imports? In October there was no decrease in imports, but imports actually increased; but customs receipts fell off from \$30,000,000 to \$16,000,000, a loss of \$14,000,000. There is but one answer, gentlemen—your tariff rates are too low.

In considering our revenues it is instructive to know the ad valorem rate of duty collected on our total imports under the Payne tariff law and under this new Democratic tariff law. I have taken our total imports and customs receipts for a two-year period ending June 30, 1913. During that period our customs receipts amounted to 18.13 per cent ad valorem of the total imports. That is, the ad valorem rate of duty collected under the last Republican tariff law. I then took the total imports and customs receipts for the 12 months ending December 31, 1914, and find the average ad valorem rate under the present tariff law to be 13.35 per cent.

In arriving at that rate—13.35 per cent ad valorem—under this new law, I deducted from the customs receipts collected for the calendar year of 1914 a portion of the duty collected on sugar for January and February, 1914, amounting to the difference between the rate fixed in the Underwood tariff law and the Payne tariff law, because the duty on sugar in the Underwood tariff law carried the rate fixed by the Payne tariff law to March 1, 1914.

During the calendar year of 1914 imports amounted to \$1,789,523,000, on which were collected \$238,983,000 in customs receipts. If an ad valorem rate of duty of 18.13 per cent, the rate under the Payne law, had been collected on those imports, it would have produced \$324,440,000 in customs receipts, which is no less than \$85,457,000 more than you are collecting under the present ad valorem rate of duty.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a very brief question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. He stated that under the Payne-Aldrich tariff we would have had \$85,000,000 more?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Is not that an admission that even under the Aldrich tariff we would have had a deficiency?

Mr. FORDNEY. We would have had if we had kept up your extravagant appropriations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

According to the terms of the new tariff law, one year from May 1 next sugar will go on the free list. At present in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 per year is being collected in duty on imported sugar. The Democrats will lose that \$50,000,000 per year after April, 1916. At present, notwithstanding the so-called war tax and the corporation and income tax, the Democrats are not obtaining sufficient revenues to meet the running expenses of the Government. What will you do, my friends, next year, when your difficulties are increased by some \$50,000,000? It seems to me Democrats in power will be compelled to do one of four things:

First. Enact an additional so-called war-tax measure.

Second. Resort to a bond issue.

Third. Increase rates of duties on imports.

Fourth. Materially reduce the expenditures of the Government.

One of the planks in the platform on which the Democratic Party came into power promised "Freedom from oppressive taxation." You made the people of the country believe they were oppressed by the Republican policy of raising revenue. They are now beginning to realize they did not know what taxation was until the Democrats took control of affairs. The people were allured by your political pledges and promises, but now they are being disillusioned by a realization of Democratic shortcomings.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. You suggest four courses to follow by the party now in power to meet the conditions at that time. Might you not suggest a fifth, which will be the one probably taken—the turning of the affairs, fiscal and otherwise, over to a party who knows how and will be able to take care of them?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and I hope to be one of that party.

In recent legislation, it appears to me, the hands at the wheel have been guided by wild ideals, unbalanced theories, poor business training, and an overwhelming desire to satisfy popular clamor.

You promised to reduce the cost of living, and proceeded to enact laws that must necessarily increase the cost of production. Your legislation is stopping the wheels of progress. Every law that adds to the cost of production, by imposing additional

obligations on the producer, increases the necessity for a protective tariff law. When foreign countries prohibit child labor and when foreign countries increase wages and the standard of living of the laboring classes, then, and not until then, can we adopt such laws and hope to prosper under a low-tariff policy. It is absurd to think otherwise.

Of the cost of production of a yard of cotton in a cotton mill in the State of New Jersey, as given by the proprietor of a factory in that State, 60 per cent goes to labor, 34 per cent is paid for raw material, and 6 per cent for overhead charge; but the so-called raw material of the manufacturer is the finished product of the farmer and cotton gin. With transportation charges figured in, at least 80 per cent of the cost of the raw material goes to labor, either on the farm or in transportation. Considering the labor cost in the raw material, labor receives approximately 87 per cent of the total cost of production of a yard of cotton.

The labor cost in the factory, however, receives about 60 per cent of the total cost of production, and in the New Jersey cotton mills this labor received an average of \$1.42 per day. The same class of labor in the cotton mills of Japan received but 17½ cents per day. In other words, the Japanese labor cost is but one-eighth of the labor cost in the State of New Jersey. In cotton costing 10 cents per yard to produce, the labor employed in the factory received 6 cents per yard. That same work in the factories in Japan is done for three-fourths of 1 cent per yard. It will be seen from this that the Japanese manufacturer has an advantage of 5½ cents per yard in labor cost over the American manufacturer in making cotton goods costing 10 cents per yard to produce. In other words, the Japanese total cost of production of that grade of cotton is more than 50 per cent less than the cost in American mills.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Before the gentleman leaves that question, I should like to ask a question relative to the falling off of revenues since the war began.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will reach that in just a few minutes, if the gentleman will permit. I have that correctly. In the cost of a yard of cotton in this country, measured on a pound weight, let me say to you that in a medium grade of cotton the labor cost is six-tenths of the total cost. Rather, six-tenths of the cost of the production of that yard of cotton is labor cost after the material has reached the factory. That is on a basis, my friends, of an average wage scale paid in the cotton factories north of the Mason and Dixon line of \$1.40 a day for the labor employed in the cotton mills. When Japan purchases our raw cotton from us, which she does chiefly as to the cotton used in her cotton mills, she purchases her raw material at practically the same price at which these cotton mills north of the Mason and Dixon line purchase their raw material. The only additional cost to them is the freight by water from the Pacific coast to Japan, which is a trifle. But I have here, my friends, official figures to show that in Japan, according to a report made by an American consul on December 15, 1914, there are 863,000 employees in factories operating machinery which is run by steam or other kind of power.

There are a great many employed in shops where there is no machinery and where less than 10 people are employed; but in those Japanese factories, numbering some 8,000 all told, there are 863,447 employees, according to that report of December 15, 1914, 514,000 of whom are females and but 349,000 are males. Of this total number 60,000, or 7 per cent, are children under 14 years of age. The average wage paid to men in all the factories in Japan is 26.4 cents per day in gold; to female labor in factories in Japan the wage is 13.2 cents per day; and to juvenile labor, boys, the wage is 9½ cents per day, and to girls under 14 years of age the wage is 7½ cents per day, or a total average wage to all employees in all the factories of Japan of 17½ cents a day.

The other day Democrats of the House almost went into hysteria over a bill presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] intended to regulate the employment of certain child labor in this country. To be correct, that bill, if enacted into law, will prohibit the transportation from one State to another of the product of any quarry or factory in the United States in the making of which child labor has been employed to any extent. The fact that such legislation might increase the cost of production in American institutions seems to have been given no consideration whatsoever. It has also been argued that such a law would keep child labor from displacing adult labor. Gentlemen, is your course at this time consistent with other legislation you have enacted? Are you sincere in your desire to protect adult labor from competition with child labor? I think not. I do not want to appear as an opponent to child-labor legislation; quite the contrary; but I strongly oppose your inconsistent course. Consider the enormous

amount of child labor abroad and the beggarly wages paid; consider your recent tariff legislation which throws the product of American institutions in competition with the product of child labor in foreign countries, receiving but a small fraction of the wages paid to similar labor in this country. Why do you not protect our labor of all classes from the great mass of products from foreign lands, made by millions of child laborers abroad? [Applause on the Republican side.]

First, you should enact laws that will enable the father to find employment with ample pay, so that he may feed and clothe his child; then child-labor legislation will appear more feasible to me. You should protect the labor of this country from importations of products from abroad, where the price to all labor, both child and adult, is only one-eighth of the wage paid to the average employee in the mills of this country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Have we any protection at all under the present tariff conditions in the United States against the products of that Japanese child labor?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; we have not. As an illustration, my friend, on woven cloths, cotton goods produced in Japan, our duty is 30 per cent ad valorem under the Underwood tariff law, and upon a yard of cloth which costs 10 cents per yard as we turn it out at our factories the difference in labor cost is 5½ cents a yard. Now, I ask, will 3 cents per yard duty give adequate protection to the labor employed in the cotton mills of this country? That tariff duty amounts to only 3 cents a yard, when the Japanese labor cost is 5 cents per yard below our labor cost on such goods. I say, no. There is no protection at all in that. If you wish to drown me, all that is necessary for you to do is to put me under water just 1 inch, and I will drown just as quickly as if you put me 10 feet under water. [Laughter and applause.] Your tariff law is below a protective point.

Mr. MOORE. Our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is the author of the child-labor bill, seems to think that we would take care of the labor of the United States if we passed such a law prohibiting the transportation of the products of child labor from one State to another. What protection would such a law give us from goods imported under such a condition from a foreign country?

Mr. FORDNEY. None whatever.

Mr. MOORE. On one or two occasions have not our Democratic friends actually voted down measures designed to protect the labor of this country from competition with the products of child labor imported from abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. They voted down an amendment introduced by one of my colleagues from Michigan for that purpose—overwhelmingly voted down that provision which would have prohibited the importation of the products of child labor from abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. How much competition have we from Japan on this class of work?

Mr. FORDNEY. For the calendar year 1914 we imported, among other things, of three products alone to the value of about \$90,000,000 on which child labor was largely used in Japan and China.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not the proposition you really fear, I think.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you what it is. It is silks, hats, and bonnets, things which your wife and my wife and every other man's wife ought to have the privilege of wearing, and mats and matting. We imported \$11,900,000 worth of these goods from China, and the balance of \$90,000,000 worth came from Japan. Can you picture a more destructive condition to our labor and capital than that, my friend? Our labor and capital last year came in competition with that \$90,000,000 worth of oriental products where labor received but 17½ cents per day—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Of course the gentleman's argument breaks down entirely when it is recalled that Japan's cotton goods do not come to this market in competition with ours.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes they do. During the calendar year 1914 our total exports to Japan were but \$41,000,000, while imports from Japan amounted to \$105,000,000, an unfavorable

balance of trade with Japan amounting to \$64,000,000. Whether this is manufactures of cotton or otherwise, it is the product of that cheap Japanese labor to which I am referring.

Mr. PALMER. What I wanted to ask the gentleman about especially was this matter of child labor, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me in his remarks.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; with all due courtesy.

Mr. PALMER. I just want to get the gentleman's point of view. Would the gentleman be glad if some statesman would rise in some parliament of Europe and make the same statement about our little children of America that he is making to-day in the American Congress about the children of Japan?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not quite get the sense of the gentleman's question.

Mr. PALMER. Well, it is pretty plain.

Mr. FORDNEY. It may be plain to you, but it is not plain to me. What I am in favor of is not only protecting child labor in this country, but protecting all American labor from child labor abroad. I endeavor at all times to be consistent. It seems that some men prominent in public life try to take advantage of and ride to political success on every wave of popular clamor that sweeps over this country, but it is mighty difficult for such men even to appear consistent. It is very popular to say "reduce the cost of living"; it is popular to say "shorten the hours of labor"; it is popular to say "let us increase wages"; but if you increase wages, shorten the hours of labor, and enact all manner of legislation placing restrictions on our industrial institutions, you greatly increase the cost of production. This kind of legislation meets with madly enthusiastic support. Each bill taken separately may appear commendable, but taken together they are inconsistent and not practical. To enact all this kind of legislation and at the same time remove the barrier of protection from foreign importations is highly inconsistent. Yet you profess to see no reason why American industries can not compete successfully without tariff protection with foreign industries employing cheap labor and complying with no child-labor laws, workmen's compensation laws, minimum-wage laws, laws affecting the hours of labor, or laws imposing other restrictions which increase the cost of production. When under such conditions unfavorable to American industries a business depression comes upon us and the wheels of industry are stopped you blame it all on a "state of mind" or "imagination."

Your proposed child-labor law affects only the products of mills and factories, and does not affect farm products. If you are going to be consistent and equitable in your efforts to protect all the poor people and protect the labor of this country, then you must not segregate from the great mass simply the poor people who happen to live in the city engaged in certain kinds of employment and not include in your protection all the others throughout the land.

Mr. PALMER. If that is the gentleman's opinion, he has not read the child-labor law.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have read the proposed child-labor law. You do not include anything that is made on the farm when you exclude from shipment child-labor products from one State to another. You include only the products of the factory or the mines or the quarry.

Mr. PALMER. I thought the gentleman said the contrary.

Mr. FORDNEY. No. You should include all child labor if you wish to be fair to all our people. But in your proposed law you class our industries and our children. Do not understand me that I am in favor of placing this ban on our child labor on our farms; but I say your proposed law is class legislation. Why do you not protect all our laborers against this child labor across the sea? I am criticizing the recent tariff and revenue legislation and the inconsistent course of the Democratic Party.

Mr. PALMER. What I am trying to get from the gentleman is, Does the gentleman approve of this labor of the little children in Japan at 9½ cents a day?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, I do not; but you evidently do.

Mr. PALMER. I do not.

Mr. FORDNEY. You evidently do, because you helped to pass the Underwood tariff law, and by its terms the product of that child labor in Japan and Europe comes into this country, and not only comes in competition with the child labor in this country but comes in competition with the labor of all classes of our people. I voted against that law. You voted for it. You took a prominent part in framing that law, and that tariff law is responsible for heavy imports of foreign-made goods into this country, 63 per cent of which come in free of any duty, practically all of which displaces American labor. Which one of us, then, is the friend of our laborers, you or I? Let the people decide.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact that our friend Mr. PALMER and his colleagues on the Demo-

cratic side actually voted against an amendment to keep the product of child labor out of this country when the convict-labor bill was up?

Mr. FORDNEY. They did, and my friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] offered that amendment.

Mr. GILL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be obliged to the gentleman if he will wait a few minutes. Gentlemen are consuming my time. If I can get more time, I will answer all questions.

Here are official figures just given to me by the Legislative Reference Bureau Saturday last, which show that in Austria 3 per cent of all their employees in their factories are children under 14 years of age, or, in number, 15,521. In England 36,995 children are under 14 years of age and 945,000 of the people employed in the factories of England are under 18, or between 14 and 18 years of age, a total of 19.6 per cent of all the employees in all the factories of England being under 18 years of age.

In Belgium there are 1,710,000 employees over 12 years of age. That is not very definite, but it is reasonable to suppose that a large number are under 14. In France there are 549,000 children, or 18 per cent of all the employees in the factories of France are children. In Germany 440,000 children, or 7.1 per cent of all the factory employees are children. In Italy 228,944, or 10 per cent of all the employees in the factories are under 15 years of age. In Switzerland 51,000 out of 328,000, or 16 per cent of all their employees, are under 18 years of age, chiefly under 14 years of age. There are 2,268,448 children employed in the mills in those countries abroad which I have referred to. Millions upon millions, hundreds of millions of dollars of the products of that labor come into this country annually, and yet you voted to lower the duties on those imports, to throw down the bars, and invite the whole world to come in and bring their products to our market and depress the earnings of the American laboring man. By such legislation, my friends, American labor has been thrown out of employment, as you know and I know; and if I only had the time I would call your attention to the various industries that are to-day laying off and have laid off multitudes of men, till the number now reaches 3,000,000 of idle, unemployed labor in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FORDNEY. Just let me conclude this statement. In all these factories in Japan the total daily wages paid to 863,000 employees amount to \$153,000 a day, while in 1913 one single great corporation in this country, the United States Steel Corporation, employed 246,000 people and paid an average wage of \$2.91, or a total of \$715,000 a day, four and one-half times the daily wages paid to all the employees in all the factories in Japan. In other words, one corporation in the United States paid to 246,000 employees four and one-half times the daily wages paid in Japan to 863,000 employees.

Gentlemen, that is a striking illustration. By free trade or a tariff for revenue only you can not lift up the cheap labor of the whole world to our standard of life and living, but you are sure by such laws to bring down to the general level our standard of life and living by free trade, or a tariff for revenue only; because a tariff for revenue law is only the grandmother of free trade. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] You would not have any tariff at all, except for the purpose of raising revenue. That is your argument. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Michigan is a very able and prominent advocate of a higher tariff, is he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Higher than the one you have now.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want a protective tariff—

Mr. BORLAND. You want a higher tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want a higher tariff than you and your party do.

Mr. BORLAND. Now let me ask you if it is not true that during the time of the high tariff, which the gentleman helped to frame and voted for, child labor was exploited in this country to a worse extent than it ever was under any other system of revenue, and at the same time were not the wages lower and hours of labor longer for the fathers of these children than they were at any other time?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. BORLAND. Did that high tariff protect either the father or the child?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; it did.

Mr. BORLAND. Did your high-tariff law protect either the child or the father?

Mr. FORDNEY. I say, my friend, that a protective tariff law that keeps out of our markets the products of cheap labor, whether it is child labor or adult labor, from any foreign

country in the world is beneficial not only to the children but to the fathers and the mothers of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Is that argument or fact?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is a fact, and you know it as well as I do.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I know exactly the contrary.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then get your goggles on, look around you, and read; post up on the subject. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Everybody knows that times were so much better when the Republican system prevailed than they are now that it is useless to argue that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Why, my friends, right now on Jefferson Avenue in the city of Detroit, a city in the State from which I come and which I have the honor to represent in part, there is a soup house, the first one ever established in that city since God's sun shone down upon that beautiful city. These are Democratic times now, and there is scarcely an important city in this land that has not some sort of establishment doling out something to eat to the unemployed through charity, and you know it.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. There are 10,000 in this city to-day.

Mr. FORDNEY. Ten thousand right here at our doors, and I did not know it.

Mr. BORLAND. And nobody else knows it, either.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. It was announced yesterday in one of the newspapers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are 500,000 in Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. BORLAND. Nobody knows any such thing as that, either.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I should have said 5,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Not even that many, when the gentleman from Kansas cuts it down from 500,000 to 5,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. I know the gentleman will be courteous enough to yield the floor to me.

Mr. BORLAND. I apologize to the gentleman for having aroused this disturbance. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. My time is so limited, please be brief.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the gentleman to say that imports at this time are less than they were under the former tariff law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; I have not said anything of the kind. I say the customs receipts are less. For instance, take the month of December, 1914. Our exports for that month, owing to the great demand for many of our supplies because of the European war, exceeded any month in the history of our country with the exception of four.

Our imports fell off \$70,000,000 for December, 1914, as compared with December, 1913; but if the gentleman will give me time I have a statement right here, the official figures, that will give all this kind of information.

The imports into this country for December, 1913, exceeded any month in the history of this country since 1906, and our imports for the month of December, 1914, were the lowest importations in any month in the history of this country since 1906. These months are not a fair comparison.

Our loss of balance of trade for the calendar year of 1914—and it is the only year on which we can correctly figure, because it is the only full year in which the Underwood bill has been in effect—was \$369,817,475; and that money which we lost, which we sent abroad to buy products of foreign labor in foreign lands, would have employed at \$50 per month more than 610,000 of the unemployed men now seeking employment and begging for something to do in the United States.

I have here a statement showing the condition of wages paid labor on railroads in this country and in Europe as illustrative of the condition of our standard of pay and theirs. The wages paid in 1913, the last year for which I have statistics, to laborers on railroads in this country averaged \$14.56 per week. In Canada, just across the border, railroad employees received \$12.46 per week. In the United Kingdom they received \$5.36 per week. You would bring us in competition with that labor. In Germany they received \$7.77 per week, and in France an average of \$4.05 per week to all the employees on all the railroads in France.

Germany has Government-owned railroads. Ninety-five per cent of her roads are Government-owned, and it costs more money to build her roads under Government control than it costs to build and equip the finest equipped railroads in the world—the railroads in the United States.

And yet our railroads carried a ton of freight a mile for seventy-two one-hundredths of a cent, while in Germany the charge is 1.42 cents per ton per mile.

My Democratic friends, let me tell you with what you are face to face. You admitted that when you introduced your tariff law in this House that you were going to lose about \$70,000,000 in customs receipts each year. You adopted in lieu of that loss which you figured on, the income-tax law, and you increased the tax on corporations; that is to say, you removed the \$5,000 limitation provided for in the Payne tariff law, on which no tax was paid, and you adopted in its place a so-called war-tax measure. Let me tell you what your war-tax measure has done. When you passed the bill through this House you estimated that the revenue to be derived from that bill this year would be \$107,000,000. The Senate changed the law, and when it came back you estimated the receipts would be about \$90,000,000 annually. You have collected in 2 months and 19 days, additional revenue from internal sources amounting to \$11,000,000. Credit it all to your war-tax measure and you are going to collect according to this rate less than \$50,000,000 this year under the war tax. You are spending more than \$100,000,000 in the expenses of this Government over and above the largest amount ever spent by any Republican administration. I am not criticizing you for that, for it may be necessary with the increase of population, but where are you going for revenue for the increased expenditures? The difference in this and the last fiscal year, up to February 19, was \$57,906,000.

You have widened the breach between your income and the expenditures of this Government to that amount during this fiscal year.

As I have said, you propose now to put sugar on the free list. Ah, my friends, you will recede from that position within 12 months, or you will do one of the three things I have mentioned—you will reduce the expenditures of the Government, you will have a bond issue, or you must go to the collection of greater sums in the customhouses from imports.

I wish I had time to fully discuss this matter.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know that the postal receipts are falling off at the rate of \$20,000,000 a year on account of depression in business and the lack of correspondence?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. MADDEN. And that they are reducing the wages of the men employed in the Postal Department at the rate of \$200 a year on account of the lack of funds?

Mr. FORDNEY. I was not aware of that fact, but do not dispute its correctness. On the 3d day of February, I received a letter from Mr. Gary, chairman of the United States Steel Corporation. He said that on the 3d day of January of this year that company had 150,000 at work, whereas in 1913 they employed 246,000 men, which shows their business to be in a chaotic condition.

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. TAGGART. Did not Mr. Carnegie state before the committee over here that the steel corporation did not want any protective tariff?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; Mr. Carnegie has stated that the steel company needed no protection, but Mr. Carnegie is a bondholder and not a manufacturer. I asked Mr. Carnegie the following question when he was before our committee: "My dear sir, when you were in the business in 1870, what rate of protection did you have?" He said, "Oh, puckachee; I never gave it any thought." And yet he at that time had \$28.50 per ton protection on steel and gave the question no thought. I believe he did—

Mr. WHITACRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITACRE. Is Judge Gary authority for the statement that the cause of the present business depression is that the big business people quit new enterprises, that the railroads refused to make extensions or do any further business for the last year; and do not the figures show that the extension of railroad business so far as freight-car building is concerned is one-half what it was in 1913, and that it is the same way in all other lines?

Mr. FORDNEY. It does not make any difference what Judge Gary said or what I say.

Mr. WHITACRE. Did he say it?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me tell the gentleman a fact. For the first time since the Civil War there is not a mile of new railroad under contract for construction to-day; not a mile, and since 1880 the average construction of railroad mileage in this country, main lines, has been 5,261 miles per year.

Mr. WHITACRE. Right there will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait one moment. There are seven employees per mile on railroads, or in other words, some 40,000 persons per year for the newly constructed railways have been employed in this country for all these years. You, by your legislation, have brought on business depression not only in the steel business, but in every line of industry (that is not directly affected favorably by the war in Europe, such as food supplies and the manufacture of arms and ammunition demanded now by these foreign countries). Business depression extends to nearly every industry all over this land. I am in business. I know. Get into business and find out, my friend. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHITACRE. I am in business and I know, too. Is not this true, according to Judge Gary, that the railroads consume from 40 to 60 per cent of all of the iron and steel, and that they have quit building, and that that accounts absolutely for all of the loss in the iron and steel business for the last year? Is not that a fact?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not a fact, but is partially responsible for this great business depression. Every great industry has curtailed purchases.

Mr. WHITACRE. Then, show us why.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell why.

Mr. WHITACRE. Wait a minute—

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I will not wait another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am in a small way a purchaser of steel rails, and to-day, in Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, or San Francisco I can purchase German steel rails cheaper than I can buy American steel rails; therefore, I say foreign cheap imports are chiefly responsible for this business depression.

In conclusion, I would say it seems to be the desire of the administration to have the country believe the so-called war tax will be unnecessary as soon as the terrible conflict in Europe is ended; that added customs receipts will make up the deficit. How much would imports have to increase to accomplish this result?

During the 12 months ending June 30, 1913, under a Republican tariff law, customs receipts amounted to \$318,142,000, or an average of \$26,500,000 per month. These customs receipts were collected on imports amounting to \$1,814,000,000 for the year, or an average of \$151,000,000 per month.

Under the Democratic tariff law, from January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, a period of 7 months wholly unaffected by the war in Europe, \$156,500,000 of customs receipts were collected, which is an average of \$22,300,000 per month. Imports for these 7 months aggregated \$1,141,094,000, or an average of \$163,000,000 per month. On increased importations amounting to an average of \$12,000,000 per month, customs receipts declined under the new tariff law \$4,200,000 per month. For a year it would mean increased importations over the Republican year of \$144,000,000, with \$50,400,000 lost in customs receipts. For fair argument let us say you have made up this loss in revenue with your income tax, which is giving you the benefit of a serious doubt, and let us say your expenditures exceed Republican expenditures by \$100,000,000, which is expressing it mildly. When free sugar becomes effective it will cause an added loss of revenue of \$50,000,000 per year and decrease the ad valorem rate of duty collected on all imports; but for fair argument let us say you will collect 13.35 per cent duty on the total importations into this country, as at present. It is evident, if the war is ended in Europe and your so-called war tax abolished, that customs receipts must increase approximately \$150,000,000 per year more than the average receipts collected during the first 7 months of 1914, prior to the war in Europe. At 13.35 per cent ad valorem it would be necessary for imports to increase no less than \$1,123,000,000 to provide an additional \$150,000,000 in revenue.

It is not the war in Europe, gentlemen, that is to blame. Your revenue laws and appropriations are not in harmony. The close of the war in Europe will not end your difficulties, gentlemen, but, on the other hand, it will compel you to admit the responsibility of conditions you delight in attributing to the disturbance across the seas.

No better illustration of the folly of the present administration in dealing with the tariff can be had than is afforded by the range of prices in the sugar market during the past year.

When the refining interest appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the Democratic House in 1912, and again in 1913, following the last presidential election, they promised that if the duty were lowered so as to enable them to secure cheaper raw sugar they would cheapen the price of the finished product to the consuming public.

There is absolutely no question—

Said their spokesman, Mr. Lowry, of the Federal Sugar Refining Co.—

but that the consumer will get all the benefit from "free sugar" or a reduction in the tariff rate on raw sugar, with a corresponding reduction in the rate on refined sugar.

The American farmers, who were about to be sacrificed to the greed of the sugar refining combine, warned Congress that sugar would be no cheaper; that the farmers of the United States, the Federal Treasury, and the consumers would suffer and that the Sugar Trust would advance prices just as rapidly as it was relieved of domestic competition. The free-trade element in Congress preferred to believe the Sugar Trust rather than the American farmers, just as that element preferred to take the word of the leather manufacturers when they appeared here six years ago and pleaded for free hides.

In both instances the result has been the same. The leather manufacturers made no reduction in the price of their goods, but in the past six years the American farmers and the United States Treasury have lost millions of dollars as a result of the free-hides folly.

In the case of sugar the whole proceeding has been little less than a scandal. When I addressed the House on September 25 I called attention to a resolution I had offered in the Ways and Means Committee when the war-tax bill was being considered which would permit the State of Louisiana to go before the Supreme Court of the United States and test the legality of the sugar duties as now enforced by the Treasury Department.

The difference in the duty collected by the present administration and the rate which many of the ablest lawyers believe should be enforced amounted, from March 1 to December 31, 1914, to the huge sum of \$15,946,539. This money which was lost to the Federal Treasury inured solely to the benefit of the sugar-refining combine. The consumer did not receive the benefit of one cent of that colossal sum.

The Secretary of the Treasury wrote a letter in which he said it would be "useless" to try a suit which might recover this large amount of money for the impoverished Federal Treasury and which might save even a larger sum during the current year. Fortunately, the Committee on the Judiciary of this House did not agree with him, and a few days ago ordered a favorable report upon a resolution similar to the one I made an unsuccessful attempt to have incorporated in the war-tax bill.

The Judiciary Committee in its report says:

It is suggested that to refuse this permission, asked for by a sovereign State, may set a precedent harassing to the Republic in moments of stress and dangerous in its consequences.

Your committee, therefore, appreciating that the petitioner is a sovereign State, desirous of asserting a right and anxious to shield itself from loss and injury, and that the United States Government, while incurring neither risk nor inconvenience, may as a result derive important benefits, feel constrained to urge that the permission sought be granted by this Congress.

The New York Herald of August 18 last published in conspicuous type an interview with Wallace P. Willett, sugar statistician of New York, dealing with the effect of the European war on the sugar market, in which he was quoted as saying:

The American Sugar Refining Co. on the outbreak of the war adopted a policy of not selling sugar for export at all in order to meet the extraordinary demand, and has kept all of its stock of raw sugar to be refined only and solely for American consumers at prices which up to last Friday were half a cent a pound below the prices of some of the other refiners. That company, in order to avoid undue speculation in sugar by jobbers, retail dealers, and consumers has limited its sales to each purchaser. * * *

If the Government will take steps to stop completely the exportation of sugar to Great Britain and other countries, the present supply and that of 500,000 tons coming in October will reduce prices to somewhere near normal. That is the only way to stop a doubling of the prices of to-day, if the war continues.

The Herald continues:

Inquiry developed the fact that all of the big retail grocery stores, while charging from 7½ to 8 cents a pound for sugar, are limiting their sales to individual customers to from 5 to 25 pounds.

Praise from such a source and the pursuit of a policy so patriotic would seem to entitle the American Sugar Refining Co. to a place among the "good trusts." But instead of keeping its stock "only and solely for American consumers" the public press on January 29 of this year carried a statement sent out from Philadelphia that—

Wholesale grocers and commission men throughout the eastern part of the United States are now paying \$1.07 more per hundred pounds for refined sugar than Great Britain is paying for shipments from the same refineries.

This discrimination in favor of foreign buyers, which is made possible under existing laws, is now the practice of all seaboard refineries, according to the information supplied here to-day by a leading distributor.

WOULD HAVE CONGRESS ACT.

Last week, when the domestic trade was paying the refiners \$4.851 cash per hundred pounds for sugar, the British Board of Trade was purchasing from American producers large quantities at \$3.78.

"It would be exceedingly interesting," said the distributor, "for Congress to demand the production of the books of the American refiners to show the price charged the domestic consumers as against the foreign consumer on the same date, bearing in mind that the refiner in the case of sugar exported is allowed a drawback equal to the amount of the duty previously paid by him for the raw sugar brought into this country."

"QUOTE FIGURES OF REFINERS."

"The present duty on raw sugar from Cuba is approximately \$1.02 per hundred pounds. The refiners' price last week was \$4.95, less 2 per cent for cash, making the net cost to the wholesalers \$4.851. When the refined sugar is exported, however, the Government allows a drawback of \$1.01, making the sale price \$3.841. The figures seem to have been shaded by the British Board of Trade, which enabled them to contract at \$3.78."

The trust was engaged in running up the price of refined sugar at the expense of the consumer in August; it was engaged in the reverse policy of beating down the price of raw sugar at the expense of the farmers two months later. About the middle of October, just as the Louisiana crop was ready for harvest, the Sugar Trust which for years had enjoyed a monopoly of that crop and, as the sole purchaser, had fixed prices to suit itself, announced unexpectedly to the dismayed Louisiana farmers that the American Sugar Refining plant at Chalmette, the largest in the world, would be closed for an indefinite period.

In contrast with its statement issued in August that in view of the threatened shortage sugar would be doled out to the grocers a barrel at a time, the trust now coupled the announcement of the closing down of the Chalmette refinery with the explanation that it was overstocked with sugar. Mr. Charles P. Montgomery, of the American Sugar Refining Co., gave out a statement in New Orleans on October 28 in which he said:

When I came here and read the local papers I was surprised to find that the critics of the company here are so ill informed on the conditions in the sugar markets elsewhere.

In Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Jersey City, where our company has big plants, there are on hand barrels and barrels of sugar that we can not move. Now even our export chances are cut off. England, you know, has just barred out our sugar in order to keep German beet sugar out of England.

My knowledge of this company dates back three and a half years. I came to it prejudiced because of my activity against it in behalf of the Government when chief of customs. Since that time I have had an intimate knowledge, having been sought by the company to take up its Government business.

It is not generally known that this company has lost heavily since the war broke out. We had contracts calling for the delivery of thousands of sacks of sugar at old prices, and we lived up to these contracts when sugar went to 5.62. We have great stacks of sugar at the Chalmette refinery now that we bought at this high-water price and could sell at about a cent less in the present market.

It is entirely unjust and unfair for the company's critics to attempt to brand it as a "bandit corporation." While such names do the American Sugar Refining Co. no tangible harm, constant attacks tend to put the company in a bad light before the public. The facts do not warrant these attacks, and the facts are not concealed from the public. Anybody interested may come to us and find out the truth. Anybody interested is invited to come down to Chalmette and see the stacks of sugar laying on our hands.

The Sugar Trust in closing the Chalmette refinery attempted to play its old game of intimidation once too often. The governor of Louisiana and the sugar farmers of Louisiana took no stock in the explanation it made for closing down its refining plant on the eve of the crop movement, and the governor directed the district attorney at New Orleans to bring ouster proceedings in the name of the State against the American Sugar Refining Co., which was characterized as a trust operating in restraint of trade. This litigation has not yet been finally determined.

The sugar farmers of Louisiana have this season for the first time in history converted the bulk of their raw product into white table sugars and have sold it in competition with the trust. If the Democratic free-sugar clause in the tariff bill is repealed before all of the American farmers are forced out of the cultivation of sugar, it seems probable that the cane farmers and the beet farmers will in the future be able to compete with the trust for the domestic sugar market.

The cane-sugar farmers, however, have not been permitted to bid for the grocery trade except at a tremendous struggle. Notwithstanding Mr. Montgomery's statement on behalf of the trust, in which he attributed the tremendous stock of sugar on hand as the reason for the closing of the Chalmette refinery on the eve of the Louisiana cane-grinding season, no sooner had the farmers of that State begun to put their table sugars on the market than the trust rushed additional supplies to their already glutted warehouses at Chalmette. Two cargoes of sugar were shipped from Philadelphia in December and early in January of the present year. The second of these shipments in dealing with the tariff can be had than is afforded by the range of prices in the sugar market during the past year. of this last shipment, says:

This total cargo of some 6,000,000 of pounds of sugar, or 3,000 short tons, was brought out by this steamship from Philadelphia around to New Orleans, in the Mississippi Valley, to supply the trade of the

American Sugar Refining Co. for refined sugars. It was unwilling to refine these sugars in New Orleans, and hence brought the sugar from a market where the price for 96 test sugar was about 20 cents per 100 pounds higher than in New Orleans; paid the freight from Philadelphia to New Orleans, and then supplied its trade from New Orleans in the adjacent country and up the river at prices a shade higher than those current in the city of New York. If there were such a god or goddess as Nemesis, or retributive justice, the Sugar Trust in this particular instance has certainly and possibly unconsciously invoked the penalty of that retributive justice upon its own head by this plan of bringing sugars from the North to this market, where there was already an abundant supply both of 96 test sugars and of white granulated sugars, bringing the sugars from a northern center of distribution at an increased cost to a southern center of distribution, and doing it presumably to thwart and interfere with the sale of locally produced white granulated, for which there should be an active demand. In this the trust has added to its many offenses against the sugar industry of Louisiana. This shows a dog-in-the-manger policy of special interference with the white sugar demand that is now reaching all the white sugar producers here, and this 6,000,000-pound cargo of white sugar from Philadelphia comes forward to crush by its competition, if it can, the rapidly growing trade for Louisiana white sugars. * * *

Now, when the hand of the State government is laid upon the Sugar Trust and it feels the criminal halter about its neck, it is driven to every extreme to find some means by which it can justify its course; and yet in bringing white sugars into New Orleans from Philadelphia by the great shipload, instead of accommodating the people of the country in which it makes its living by taking the local sugars, it is really adding insult to injury and is endeavoring as far as it can to prevent the producers of white sugars in Louisiana from getting a fair price for their own product.

The current quotations for 96-test sugar in New Orleans have been held down to about 20 cents per hundred pounds below the New York price, and the freights from Philadelphia to New Orleans aggregate a cost of about 20 cents per hundred pounds for bringing the sugar this way, and thus the Sugar Trust actually pays out 40 cents per hundred pounds, or \$8 per ton, or \$24,000 for this supreme effort that it is now making to damage the sugar planters of Louisiana by bringing in locally, not coals to Newcastle, but New York sugars into New Orleans, where there now exists a large supply of white granulated sugars entirely adequate for the market.

If the Sugar Trust was concerned in the slightest degree with the good of Louisiana, it could have bought large quantities of 96-test sugar here at the lower price and made its own white granulated, and have come into fair competition with the plantation white-sugar producers.

It shows, instead, the indirect and yet bulldozing desire to flood the market with supplies from Philadelphia, and the great steamship *El Rio*, of the Morgan Line, comes to Louisiana with this cargo here purposely to punish those who have been, and are still, endeavoring to whip the trust.

Unhappily for the Sugar Trust, these schemes will not work in Louisiana. Every such effort gives increasing evidence of the absolute insincerity of all of the allegations of the Sugar Trust in their own defense, and gives increased strength to the spirit of resistance that the Sugar Trust has developed in Louisiana. Our people feel that if they could get rid of this octopus, drive it out of the land, it would be far better for all concerned, and that a healthy growth of the sugar industry, developed by fair competition and not by the grasping hand of this monopoly, would result finally in a living chance for the sugar planters of Louisiana. This \$90,000,000 corporation, with its iron hands now endeavoring to strangle the Louisiana sugar industry, with its great sugar refinery at the mouth of the river, ready to take in supplies from Philadelphia rather than from Louisiana at fair competitive prices, should be driven from the land as the common enemy of everyone who loves his State, the land of his birth, or his adopted home.

Notwithstanding the severe blow dealt their industry by the Democratic Party and the machinations of the trust, which is undisturbed under the present supine policy pursued by the Department of Justice, the sugar farmers of this country are making a supreme effort that should meet with the sympathy and support of all fair-minded men. The Louisiana Planter and Sugar Manufacturer, in another recent issue, says:

The Sugar Trust carefully suppressed all efforts to lessen its strangle hold on the sugar industry of Louisiana by boycotting brokers, dealers, and sugar receivers in Louisiana and by notifying distributing brokers throughout the country that to sell their goods they must discontinue all other relations with Louisiana and confine themselves exclusively to the Sugar Trust goods. * * *

The new life that the Louisiana sugar industry is now entering upon probably marks one of the most, if not the most, interesting eras in its history. All of the now great sugar factories of Louisiana can make pure white sugars, can make beautiful yellow crystals, can make fine sirups, and the cane growers of the State can readily produce sugar-cane enough to supply them all, and with these resources a half million long tons of the highest grades of sugar can readily be placed in the Mississippi Valley every year. The beet-sugar people will produce another half million tons, and our own people will then have produced within the limits of the mainland a million tons of sugar, and this can be done with no other effort than that of equalizing the cost of human labor in this country as compared with other countries and as utilized in the sugar industry. We shall hope, and we believe that the good sense of our National Legislature will bring it to the same mind and that even our determined President will be willing to sign a coming sugar-tariff bill which will maintain a schedule of duties equal to those now granted, which duties, we believe, will make our sugar industry permanently survive.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, while the echoes of this attack upon American business prosperity is still in the Hall I want to give the gentleman some facts that he has evidently overlooked. I know that he overlooked the facts that I put in the Record a few days ago showing the balance of trade was in our favor on an average of nearly \$300,000,000 a year, and had been since the 1st of December, 1914. I want now to read the following brief extract from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday morning, February 10, 1915:

FACTORY WHEELS TO HUM—ROEBLING CO., OF TRENTON, PREPARES FOR BUSY TIMES.

TRENTON, N. J., February 9.

"We will begin rebuilding as soon as possible that part of our plant destroyed by fire a few weeks ago," said F. W. Roebing, secretary and treasurer of the John A. Roebing Sons' Co., wire manufacturers, to-day. "When finished, an extra force of men will be put to work at night, so that part of our factory will be running night and day. Things are looking better. There is an improvement."

Mr. Roebing believes that, unless some unforeseen turn in the war takes place, a gradual clearing away of the clouds of depression will start things moving toward normal conditions.

Every manufacturer of automobile tires in Trenton is doing a good business, and orders are increasing. One concern has doubled its output. Another is so pressed that the men are working in three shifts of eight hours each.

Mr. MOORE rose.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, just one minute. Let me finish this, and then I will yield to the gentleman. I continue:

The Pennsylvania Railroad is about to begin improvements that will cost \$200,000.

The heads of the Roebing concern and of a majority of the rubber factories say the future looks brighter than at any time since the war began.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the great Pennsylvania Railroad is actually going to spend \$200,000 in making improvements?

Mr. BORLAND. In one town. The gentleman will probably find they are continuing improvements in other towns in the same way.

Mr. MOORE. If they were going to expend \$200,000 in Kansas City, would the gentleman rejoice?

Mr. BORLAND. I certainly would.

Mr. MOORE. Why, that is a mere bagatelle. It does not amount to anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the chairman of the "sob squad." [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has referred to the Roebing Co. Does he not know that the Roebing Co. are making barbed wire for the European war?

Mr. BORLAND. They are making wire. I do not know the class of wire, and I do not know that the gentleman does.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman notice about the 750,000 railroad men who are going to have their wages decreased? Did the gentleman notice that in the newspapers yesterday?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and I expect to speak upon that at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would not ask the time of the House at this stage of its proceedings, with so many important measures to be considered in the short time remaining of this session, to make a tariff speech, but so much has been said in this House and in the press of the country about the responsibility of the Underwood tariff law for the depression in business and for the decreased revenues of the Government that I desire to insert in the Record an open letter upon that subject written by the editor of the St. Louis Republic to Mr. Walter S. Dickey, a Republican candidate for the United States Senate in Missouri.

This letter, I think, is a complete and a convincing answer to every criticism that has been made of the Underwood law, and I ask permission to insert it in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE TARIFF AND BUSINESS DEPRESSION—AN OPEN LETTER TO WALTER S. DICKEY.

WALTER S. DICKEY,
Kansas City, Mo.

SIR: At the Lincoln Day Young Republican banquet, held in the city of St. Louis, you said, according to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of the following morning:

"A majority of the people of the United States are again convinced that experimenting in free trade is disastrous to our people. * * * The voters of the United States will hold the Democratic Party responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment. This great, rich, new country requires a protective tariff."

We Democrats welcome this expression of opinion from one who is not a political spellbinder, accustomed to deal in unlimited talk and indiscriminate condemnation of the opposite party, but a Republican business man of standing and experience, who expects his words on economic questions to be taken seriously. I have tried in vain to evoke from the Republican press of the Middle West detailed discussion of the relation of the Underwood tariff to the prevailing business depression. I am glad to put to you certain questions, in view of certain facts, and to invite your full and explicit reply.

We have just received from Washington the Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce for December, giving statistics for the calendar year of 1914. The figures contained in this article are all taken from the publication, and the numbers in parentheses refer to its pages, to aid you in your review of our case.

In 1914, under the Underwood tariff, we imported \$28,000,000 worth of manufactures of iron and steel. (I shall use round figures to avoid confusion.) This was \$5,000,000 less than our importations in 1913 and \$700,000 less than those of 1912 (461). How can Democratic tariff policy with respect to the iron and steel schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment," in view of the fact that we imported less iron and steel manufactures in 1914 under the Underwood tariff than in either of the two preceding years under the Payne-Aldrich tariff?

Take cotton goods. This schedule is one of the protection strongholds. Last year we bought \$60,000,000 worth of manufactured cotton goods abroad (457). But the year before we bought \$65,000,000 worth, and the year before that nearly \$68,000,000 worth. Now, Mr. Dickey, how can Democratic policy with respect to the cotton schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported less cotton goods last year under the Underwood duties than in either of the two years immediately preceding under the Payne-Aldrich duties?

Look at the returns on chemicals. Under the Underwood law in 1914 we imported chemicals to the value of \$101,000,000 (456). This was almost exactly the same as the total for 1913, but it was more than \$13,000,000 less than the figures for 1912. How can Democratic policy with respect to the chemical schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported \$13,000,000 less chemicals in 1914 under the Underwood act than we did the year before under the Payne-Aldrich Act?

Take Schedule K, wools and woolens. This schedule has been called the "citadel of protection." Here on account of the lowering of rates importations of manufactured goods increased from \$17,000,000 in 1913 to \$44,000,000, nearly 2½ as much (467). But two facts need to be remembered. One is that raw wool imports under free trade increased almost \$30,000,000 worth.

Evidently the American woolen manufacturers could not have been very hard hit or what use would they have had for all this raw material? Nor has the grower suffered. The prices of wool have not fallen on account of free trade; they averaged somewhat higher in 1914 than in 1913. The other fact is that of the 99 sorts of woolens scheduled under the Underwood tariff 16 are taxed at 50 per cent or over, and 60 at 35 per cent or over, while only 17 are lower than 25 per cent, and only 5 lower than 20, this last group containing two duties of 18 per cent and free rags, shoddies, and mungo. (See the Protective Tariff Cyclo-pedia, p. 145.)

Now, Mr. Dickey, you know the history of the wool and woolen schedule, and you remember how North had a desk in Senator Aldrich's office and what Aldrich said about "the tail going with the hide." Do you believe that the changes in Schedule K are "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment"? If so, how do you reconcile the belief with the steady prices for wool and the good demand on the part of American wool manufacturers revealed in import figures?

Let us look at the earthenware, stone and china schedule, a field near akin to that of your own business. Our imports last year were a round million less in value than during the year before and a little less than for 1912 (457). How can Democratic policy with respect to the earthenware, stone and china schedule, be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment," in view of the fact that we imported less of these goods under the Underwood schedules in 1914 than in either of the two years preceding under the Payne-Aldrich schedules?

Last we come to lumber. Here the Underwood tariff puts us on a free-trade basis. And we imported lumber in 1914 to the value of a few hundred thousand dollars less than in either 1913 or 1912 (466). How can Democratic policy with respect to the lumber schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported less lumber last year under Underwood free trade than in either of the two years before under Payne-Aldrich protection?

Perhaps you feel like exercising at this point the American privilege of questioning your questioner and inquiring how the Republic accounts for the depression in the field of international trade, if the tariff has had nothing to do with it? I make haste to answer. The trouble is that the other fellows quit buying of us. They did not "flood the market" with their goods. They stopped taking ours.

The Republic holds that our business has been depressed because, as shown by the export statistics contained in pages 476-486 of the publication I have been quoting, our over-seas customers took of us in 1914 \$13,000,000 less agricultural implements, \$12,000,000 less cars and carriages, \$2,000,000 less chemicals, \$27,000,000 less copper and manufactures of copper, \$232,000,000 less cotton, \$5,000,000 less manufactures of cotton, \$94,000,000 less iron and steel manufactures, and \$39,-

000,000 less wool products and manufactures. They took \$105,000,000 worth more of foodstuffs and food animals than in the previous year, but they cut down other purchases so tremendously that their total purchases were \$377,000,000 less on the year's trade. They demanded our gold instead. They bought of us \$278,000,000 less of raw materials for manufacturing than they did the year before, \$51,000,000 less of manufactures for further use in manufacturing, and \$151,000,000 less of finished manufactures (453).

I do not need to point out to you the fact that this deficiency of \$377,000,000 on the year's business in the international field means far more than a loss of income to that amount on the part of the specific industries concerned, grave as such a loss is. As a practical man, you are familiar with the fact that receipts from productive industry go at once into the channels of trade, and that through the loss of nearly \$400,000,000 of income from the failure of the foreign buyer to purchase goods we were ready to sell, the United States lost an overturn of a vastly larger amount from its domestic trade.

Now, Mr. Dickey, I ask you as a business man whether you ever heard of a receipt for keeping business good when your customers quit buying of you? I ask you, as a student of the tariff, what possible effect the tariff can have on trade balances, except as it restricts the amount of foreign goods coming into the home market? I ask you, as a fair man, what justification can be found in the detailed statistics for 1914 as embodied in the regular official publications for the supposition that the Underwood tariff has in any way affected general business unfavorably during 1914? And I challenge you, as a critic of the tariff policy of the Democratic Party, to say wherein that policy as embodied in the Underwood Act is wrong and what rule the Republican Party proposes to follow in revising the schedules, if it gets the chance. I do not expect you to suggest detailed schedules, of course; that would be absurd. But, so far as general policy goes, what would you recommend be done with the iron and steel schedule, the cotton schedule, the chemicals schedule, the wool schedule, the china and stone ware schedule, the lumber schedule?

I shall be glad to give space to your reply.

EDITOR OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, apart from the tariff activities of this administration, which have just been discussed, was the passage the other day in the House of a shipping bill which contemplated the taking of \$30,000,000 of the people's money to buy foreign ships to discourage American labor. And prior to that a bill was passed, at the instance of the White House, providing that we take \$5,000,000 of the people's money to establish a war-risk indemnity company. The bill was rushed through both Houses, and the President signed it, and the war-risk indemnity company is now a fact. I desire, also, to have it noted that a few days ago we had before us a bill which gives American registry to vessels of foreign construction that are wrecked on the shores of the United States.

All these things dovetail together this morning when we read, under sensational headlines, that an American ship, or, rather, a ship flying the American flag, was sunk by a mine while approaching the port of Bremen. Now, I have no special desire to harrow the feelings of the American people upon this subject. I do not believe we should engage in war because this vessel has been sunk. Some gentlemen may become excited over the question, but to me what appears more serious than anything else just now is the method by which a Democratic administration has made it possible for the American people to become embroiled in a foreign war. The vessel that was blown up yesterday was the *Evelyn*, formerly of the port of Philadelphia, a vessel which was allowed to use the American flag, although built in Glasgow, Scotland, 32 years ago; a vessel that sailed under a foreign flag until she was wrecked upon the north Atlantic coast; a foreign tramp steamer that, by reason of her having been wrecked and repaired in the United States, was given American registry and permitted to use the American flag. In consequence of her being wrecked at 14 years of age, she acquired the opportunity to engage in the coastwise trade. She had the advantages of an American ship, entering into the trade along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf. For a time she ran between Philadelphia and New Orleans. She was not a success, so she was put up at auction and sold, this 32-year-old craft, repaired in 1897. Sold with a sister ship, she is said to have produced about \$54,000. Then the European war broke out. The demand for American ships in the foreign trade was acute, and because of her American registry a great value was placed upon the *Evelyn*. The ship was worth little; the American flag was worth everything. She was sold to New York parties at a good price. She engaged in the business of carrying conditional contraband abroad. The insurance companies were not willing to insure her cargo, it is said, for less than \$400,000. It is a question whether her cargo when she went down was worth \$350,000. Her cargo was largely of cotton which some of our friends wanted to get over into the war zone. It was not a question of saving this Nation from war; it was a question of going to a forbidden territory to enable somebody to make money. Those who sold the cotton and those who speculated in it can readily see the advantage of having the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States establish an insurance company, with a capital of \$5,000,000 of the people's money, to

insure such cargoes when the regular marine insurance companies refuse to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I have not the time. A ship laden with this conditional contraband—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman give me three minutes to finish this?

Mr. CALDER. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Here is a ship, rebuilt from a wreck, engaged to go into forbidden territory. She goes there at the risk of whom? Not of the individuals or independent insurance companies concerned, but at the risk of the United States Government. This old ship went over there, backed by the money of the people of the United States, by money taken out of the Treasury of the United States. The gentlemen who own the ship, according to this morning's papers, declined to make any general statement when interrogated last night. As quoted, one of the owners of the vessel says, "This is a risk; a war risk that we take," and he refers all inquiries to Washington. I called up the department this morning to get some information as to this risk, to find out how much the Government is to be mulcted for this loss, but the department and the War Risk Bureau are closed. While we are working in Congress, it is a holiday elsewhere. Meantime we have the word of the owner of the ship who sits calmly in his office in New York and says, "It is a risk we take." Yes; it is a risk—this sending of cargoes where marine insurance companies prefer not to insure. The risk is not so much with the gentlemen who put this risk up to the United States as it is with the Government that went into the war-risk insurance business. The shippers insured their cargo and they are probably all right. It is the people who must pay.

Now, remember, that ship was 32 years old, and wrecked on the Atlantic coast in 1897 and rebuilt. When we begin to purchase ships—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not. Here is a case in point. It is a loss to the Government of the United States; a money loss to the citizens of the Nation for going into a hazardous business. The question of neutrality, the question whether we shall become involved more seriously than by putting our hands in our pockets and paying this insurance bill, is left for the determination of this administration. I trust the administration will be able to deal wisely with this new war baby of its own creation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CALDER. How much time did the gentleman use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed seven minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, in the 45 minutes I am going to discuss the question of whether we have enough ammunition for our—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman to yield to me for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I may be doing a very discourteous thing, but I hope not, because I am intent upon doing a courtesy. The gentleman who is now about to address the committee ought to have a larger audience. I know of no Member of Congress who has more rightly earned the soubriquet of "a fighting Congressman" than the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has taken up this question of preparedness for war and has maintained it with an ability the like of which has not been excelled in the House. The gentleman has attained a reputation which extends far beyond the ordinary. He has been memorialized by Mr. John O'Keefe in a bit of versification that ought to be preserved. I am going to ask my friend from New York to yield me two minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Then I ask the Clerk to read this happy introduction of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. It is the tribute of Mr. O'Keefe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OUTJABBERING THE JABBERWOCK.

The bad bazoo can split the air
And rumple up the sky;
The wild whangdoodle in its lair
Gives yells that terrify.
But we have little fear of those
When, scooting down the way
Upon its twenty thousand toes,
With fire just spouting from its nose,
The growling gussiegardner goes
A-gussying all day!

The proud pazazza makes us pause
 Within the side-show tent;
 Upon the jabberwock's red jaws
 Our eyes in awe are bent.
 But what's a mere pezazza's puff
 (Although that breath can slay)
 When, with its gullet spouting guff
 (His larynx being rubber tough),
 The growling gussiegardner gruff
 Goes gussying all day?

The mad magoozlum roves the main
 And swallows up the ships;
 The savage squonkus gives us pain
 With its one thousand grips.
 But they seem Mother Peace's chums
 When, with its warlike neigh,
 With teeth a-champing in its gums
 And ears that beat like muffled drums,
 The horrid gussiegardner comes
 A-gussying all day!

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, and this is Washington's Birthday, and the gentleman has heard that wonderful Farewell Address so admirably read this morning. That address was originally delivered in the gentleman's [Mr. Moore's] own home city of Philadelphia, where liberty was born. Now, Mr. Chairman, if George Washington were to come to life again to-day and were to find that Philadelphia was sending "HAMP" MOORE to Congress, what do you suppose he would think of it? [Applause.] Do you not suppose that he would despair of the future of the country? [Laughter.]

OUR HARBOR DEFENSES MISNAMED COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. Chairman, in the three-quarters of an hour which I have at my disposal I am first going to discuss the question of the ammunition supply which we have for our seacoast defense. Next I am going to discuss the adequacy of the guns in those seacoast defenses, and then if I have any time left I am going to take up the question of the adequacy of the fortifications themselves. I am in hopes that there will not be any dispute about the facts; that I shall be able to come to a framed issue of facts with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], so that the discussion will only be as to whether or not the ammunition, for instance, is sufficient, not as to how much ammunition we have.

SEACOAST AMMUNITION.

Now, as I understand, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: In 1906 the National Coast Defense Board, known as the Taft Board, recommended that we ought to accumulate before war breaks out enough ammunition to serve all the guns in our seacoast defenses for one hour. The theory was that both coasts would not be attacked at the same time. Therefore it was supposed that it would be possible to transfer ammunition from the Pacific Coast to the Atlantic if we were to go to war with a European power. Conversely it was conjectured that it would be possible to transfer ammunition from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast if our danger lay in the Pacific Ocean. In other words, the theory was that if there were an equal number of guns on both coasts, then, by this method of transference, instead of one hour's supply, every gun on the threatened coast would have two hours' supply when war came and every gun on the unthreatened coast would be stripped, or practically stripped, of ammunition.

Now, I should be ever so much obliged if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] would follow my statement of the situation, and if he disagrees I wish he would stop me, because I am trying to state the situation fairly. Am I correct so far?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have nothing in which I desire to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to get the thing exact, and I am stating it as I understand it. Is that substantially as the gentleman understands it?

Mr. SHERLEY. As far as I caught what the gentleman said, I will not now disagree with him.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, I was in hopes the gentleman would say that I was correct. I read from the New York Sun, of December 10, a speech alleged to have been delivered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in New York. He says:

Now, turning to the continental United States, we have still some auxiliaries to the defenses to supply, but the defenses are in splendid condition, and he who would have you believe otherwise is either ignorant or vicious.

Well, I am going to be both ignorant and vicious to-day. First I shall try to persuade you, on the authority of the highest Army officers in the United States, that the ammunition supply is inadequate. I have explained the theory of the ammunition supply laid down in 1906 by the National Coast

Defense Board, or Taft Board, as it was called. But the fact is that we have not given our defenses even the minimum ammunition supply which the board recommended.

The Taft Board decreed one hour's supply for every gun in continental United States as the minimum, but we have refused to make this modest, too modest, provision. In all those years we have not given our coast defenses this one hour's supply. We have given them, from time to time, small doses of money, until now they have accumulated a little less than three-quarters of an hour's battle supply of ammunition. We have given them, to be exact, 73 per cent of the ammunition which was ordained as the minimum, and if you pass this bill you will increase that percentage from 73 to 74½. Mind you, this means 73 per cent of the requisite ammunition, not for the whole coast-defense project, but for that part of our seacoast artillery which has already been provided for in appropriations.

Now, Gen. Crozier, whose testimony is a good deal relied on by the people who take the opposite point of view from that which I take, even he testified that we must have 100 per cent of the moderate ammunition estimate of the National Coast Defense Board and that we must have it now. I refer you to this general's evidence, on page 196 of the hearings:

Gen. CROZIER. I think that, considering the fact that the allowance estimated as proper is a very moderate allowance indeed, we ought to have more than 73 per cent of it now. We ought to have 100 per cent of it.

And that, if you please, is Gen. Crozier who is testifying. Let us see what Gen. Weaver, Chief of the Coast Artillery, says about that allowance. I want to show you the character of the company associated with me in my "ignorant and vicious" views.

On page 68 of the hearings I find:

Gen. WEAVER. I have never personally been able to bring myself to think that a one hour's allowance for continental United States, with the understanding that we should shift from one coast to the other, is a reasonable rule. I think that all of our guns should have at the batteries a two hours' allowance.

Now, on page 194 of the hearings is the following:

Gen. WEAVER. I have always felt personally that the assumption that only one coast would be threatened at one time is an unsafe one on which to base such an important item as ammunition for our defense. In my opinion, we ought to contemplate a condition of affairs which might include both coasts being threatened at the same time. * * * Having in mind past experiences during the Civil War and the Spanish War and the excitable nature of our people who live on the coast, a couple of cruisers on one coast would be sufficient to hold intact both the personnel and the matériel on the least threatened coast.

There is that "ignorant and vicious" Gen. Weaver, who says our ammunition is not in proper shape and says that we ought to have two hours' supply, when we have only three-quarters of an hour's supply. Even Gen. Crozier says that we must have an hour's supply, and yet the committee has provided in this bill only 1½ per cent additional ammunition. This munificent largesse will raise the amount of seacoast ammunition on hand from 73 per cent to 74½ per cent of one hour's battle supply for all guns.

I find in a statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] which appears in the Evening Star of December 4, 1914, the following:

"The fortification subcommittee since I have been chairman," said Mr. SHERLEY, in speaking of the matter to-day, "has never held back a single dollar on essentials. It has appropriated every dollar asked for guns and battle necessities."

Is the gentleman from Kentucky correctly quoted?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Kentucky was not fully quoted.

Mr. GARDNER. All right; I will go on. I read:

"We have not appropriated everything asked for, as we thought it best to get the forts and the guns and the ammunition, and then pay attention to frills."

Is he now correctly quoted?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, without proposing to be cross-questioned as to the reported interview, I desire to say that I have given no written interview to any newspaper at any time. Newspaper men have frequently asked me about matters, and in a general conversation they have gathered impressions and have then printed what they thought was my viewpoint.

Mr. GARDNER. Was this matter which went out to the press on December 10—which went, for example, to the Boston papers—authorized by the gentleman or not at the time of his speech to the Southern Society in New York?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know what the matter is that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, does the gentleman say that his committee has given everything the department has asked for in the way of ammunition?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will give, when we reach that item, the estimates that have been asked and the amounts that have been given.

Mr. GARDNER. Then, in default of a contradiction from the gentleman, I will say that the committee has done nothing of the sort so far as concerns the appropriation for seacoast ammunition last year. I hold in my hand the fortification bill for last year. In that bill I find that the committee fixed the appropriation for seacoast ammunition at \$140,000. I find in the estimates last year that Secretary Garrison asked for \$400,000 for seacoast ammunition. I notice that Gen. Crozier, on page 195 of this year's hearings, testified that heretofore the seacoast-ammunition estimates had been made too small. But he said: "In some cases they were made under instructions, and in some cases they were made in hopelessness of getting any greater amount than was estimated for." The result is that the ammunition for the seacoast guns is still less than three-quarters of an hour's supply.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, if he desires to be correct, the gentleman will find that the ammunition for the guns is not 72 per cent, but in many caliber guns is 100 per cent, and in some over 100.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, let us be accurate about that. On page 198 of the hearings can be found the exact statement. Mind you, in some cases, it is over 100 per cent if you transfer all your ammunition from one coast to another, but it makes a lot of difference which coast you are transferring to and which coast you strip. If you transfer all your ammunition from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, where there are so many less guns, of course there will be over 100 per cent of ammunition for the limited number of guns on the Pacific coast. But suppose the war is on the Atlantic coast. Suppose that all the ammunition provided for the Pacific guns is brought across the continent to supplement the supply for the Atlantic guns. Will those Atlantic guns have their full two hours' supply as contemplated by the Taft board? By no means. Turn to page 198 of the hearings. Here is the evidence of the Chief of Coast Artillery.

Gen. WEAVER. If they were shipped from one coast to the other, the percentage for a two hours' supply would be as follows: For 3-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 4.7-inch guns, 74 per cent; for 5-inch guns, 96 per cent; for 6-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 8-inch guns, 55 per cent; for 10-inch guns, 70 per cent; for 12-inch guns, 71 per cent; and for 12-inch mortars, 34 per cent.

Mr. SHERLEY. That would depend upon what coast they were shipped from?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is, if shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic?

Gen. WEAVER. Shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SHERLEY. If, on the other hand, they were shipped from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, you would have more than 100 per cent in some instances?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes; I can work that out if you desire it. If shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast the percentages would be as I have just read them.

Now, it is true, as the gentleman says, that if we ship all the ammunition from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, that then for a great many different kinds of guns we shall have more than 100 per cent of the amount requisite for two hours' battle supply.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Surely.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will find, without regard to transferring from coast to coast, on the basis of an hour's supply for all the guns, Gen. Crozier testified as follows.

Mr. GARDNER. What page, please?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know. I will give it in a moment. I am reading from a part of it—the part that is available. Gen. Crozier says:

The allowance for the 3-inch (15-pounder) guns is 200 rounds per gun, and we have 70 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 132 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4.72-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 85 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 5-inch guns is 125 rounds, and we have 118 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 6-inch gun is 125 rounds and we have 76 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 8-inch guns is 90 rounds per gun and we have 91 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 10-inch guns is 60 rounds per gun, and we have 101 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 12-inch guns is 45 rounds per gun, and we have 110 per cent of projectiles on hand, but only 85 per cent of powder. The ammunition for the 14 and 16 inch guns is still under manufacture, for the 14-inch guns being 40 rounds, and the 16-inch 35 rounds. The allowance for the 12-inch mortars is 50 rounds, and we have 46 per cent on hand.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, does the gentleman dispute the fact that we have only 73 per cent in value of the ammunition on hand for one hour's battle supply for all our seacoast guns?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not of guns and mortars; but the gentleman stated that we had only 73 per cent of ammunition for the guns, and in that he was in error.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, let us see. I asked these questions of Gen. Weaver, because the Chief of Staff in his annual report said exactly what I have quoted.

Here is what he said:

According to the report of the Chief of Coast Artillery the amount of ammunition now available and provided for by appropriations is equal to about 73 per cent of this requirement for the guns and 50 per cent for the mortars.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] interrogated Gen. Weaver, but the exact situation did not develop. Here is the colloquy. It can be found on page 197 of the hearings:

Mr. CALDER. Gen. Weaver, I want to ask you some more of Mr. GARDNER's questions. I think you have already answered them in a somewhat different form. "Is it a fact that we have only one-half of the mortar ammunition recommended as a minimum by the National Coast Defense Board?"

Gen. WEAVER. For continental United States; yes.

Mr. CALDER. Is it a fact that we have only three-quarters, or 73 per cent, of the coast gun ammunition recommended as a minimum by the National Coast Defense Board?

Gen. WEAVER. No. I answered that question just a moment ago.

Mr. CALDER. What is the percentage we have?

Gen. WEAVER. The percentage is 73 per cent on a money value basis, and then it is approximately—

Mr. SHERLEY (interposing). You do not mean that, General. It is 73 per cent on money valuation of both guns and mortars?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

I am correct in saying that the Chief of Staff quotes the Chief of Coast Artillery to the effect that the ammunition supply is 73 per cent for the guns alone, without regard to the mortars. It is quite possible that the Chief of Staff may have made an inexact quotation. But supposing for the sake of argument that it is guns and mortars, not guns alone, which are meant, that does not substantially change the situation. When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] comments on what I am saying I hope he will refer to page 198 of the hearings and take up Gen. Weaver's evidence, wherein we are told what would happen if an attempt were made to shift ammunition from the least threatened coast to the most threatened coast.

THE SEACOAST GUNS.

Let us take up the question of guns. In continental United States there is no gun bigger than a 12-inch gun mounted in any of our fortifications. There are four unmounted 14-inch guns on the Pacific coast. The Panama Canal has two 14-inch guns mounted and eight more which are going to be mounted. Corregidor Island and the Hawaiian Islands have some 14-inch guns, and there is a 12-year old, 16-inch gun that has been lying in the sand up at Sandy Hook which is going down to Panama when they can get a carriage built for it. It is a gun of the old-fashioned, short type, not the type recommended for Cape Henry, for instance.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to say there were no 14-inch guns mounted in this country.

Mr. GARDNER. In continental United States there are none mounted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought we had some 14-inch guns in the fortifications on Puget Sound.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand from the Secretary of War that the only guns of that caliber in continental United States are the four guns which are to be mounted on the Pacific coast. My impression is that they are destined for the fortifications of San Diego. Undoubtedly the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] can correct me if I am wrong about that.

Mr. CALDER. I think they are for San Pedro.

Mr. GARDNER. Then they are for San Pedro, which is a newer fortification. At all events there are no other 14-inch guns mounted, unmounted, or projected in that part of the United States which is situated in North America.

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. In this European war that has been in progress nearly seven months there has not been a coast-defense gun fired, except perhaps in the Dardanelles, has there?

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely not; but if the gentleman is going to discuss general principles, I hope he will discuss them with somebody else. I want to get down to the facts.

As I have said, there is nothing larger than a 12-inch gun yet mounted in continental United States. Seventy-six out of 105 of those 12-inch guns are mounted on Crozier disappearing carriages and their range is only 13,000 yards. Think of that. On the barbette carriage, on which 29 are mounted, the range is 18,000 yards. How do these 12-inch guns compare with the naval guns mounted on the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *War Spite*

and other modern superdreadnaughts? Those naval 15-inch 45-caliber guns have a range of 21,000 yards, which is 8,000 yards, or over 4 miles, farther than the range of the best guns we have in the United States mounted on the Crozier disappearing carriage. Of our 12-inch guns 29 are mounted on barbette carriages, now considered out of fashion. Twelve-inch guns so mounted have a range of about 18,000 yards, according to the Secretary of War's letter to the Speaker January 15, 1915. But 76 of our 12-inch guns are mounted on Crozier's disappearing carriage. Their range, according to the Secretary, is no more than 13,000 yards.

"Ah, but," says Gen. Crozier, "we will alter those guns by cocking them up in the air so that we will increase the range to 20,000 yards." Very possibly. We used to have a gun that was cocked up at 45° that had a very much longer range still. In fact, the British at one time had guns which were cocked up at 45° and their range was over 45,000 yards. You can get a tremendous range if you cock your gun up high in the air. But how does that help things?

What else must be done to improve the range of our 12-inch guns? Gen. Crozier's annual report and the table on page 206 of the hearings show that you must reduce the weight of the projectile from 1,070 pounds to 700 pounds. What is the weight of the projectile which the enemy's 15-inch guns fire? About a ton—1,950 pounds, to be accurate. That is the projectile with which the attack is armed. Can we meet the situation with made-over 12-inch guns, which fire projectiles of only 700 pounds weight?

After all, these contemplated changes are not as yet made, and the testimony of Gen. Crozier himself was to the effect that it will take a year to make them. Meanwhile gentlemen are talking as if the horizon was a protection to us. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] told us the other day that a colonel in the Army had told him that an admiral in the Navy had said that these long ranges were not worthy of any consideration because ships at 20,000 yards distance were well below the horizon.

The fact is that a man about 82 feet above sea level can find the range for an object 21,000 yards away. The top of the masts on our superdreadnaughts is usually about 130 feet above sea level.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman intend to tell us anything about the probability of vessels at sea attacking any of our coast forts successfully?

Mr. GARDNER. I am coming to that. I have read some lectures in which it was asserted that in modern warfare fleets would never go against land fortifications. I was inclined to be convinced until I saw in the paper the day before yesterday that the French and English fleet has, as a matter of fact, attacked the forts at the Dardanelles.

Mr. MOORE. It has been suggested that a city like New York might not be altogether impregnable.

Mr. GARDNER. Attacking forts and coast defenses is one thing, and bombarding a city like New York is an entirely different one. It might sometimes be the case that a ship could not attack fortifications and yet could lie out of range and bombard the city which those fortifications were supposed to protect. In case of war, I doubt whether there would be a direct attack on the New York forts themselves, because I do not see why an admiral with any brains should take that risk, when all he had to do would be to land troops on the coast near by and attack the forts in the rear.

Although under present conditions a foreign admiral might not try to reduce the fortifications of New York, nevertheless I am convinced that to-day the *Queen Elizabeth* and vessels of her type could lie in safety out of range and bombard part of the city.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the feasibility of landing troops on the ocean coast itself?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know, except that Admiral Fletcher, on December 9, 1914, testified before the Committee on Naval Affairs that a foreign enemy could land almost anywhere that he had a mind to. I am not an expert. That is the sort of thing which we ought to have looked into by a commission.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are there any instances which will sustain the statement of Admiral Fletcher?

Mr. GARDNER. He mentioned our landing near Santiago.

Mr. MOORE. With that view, of what use are the fortifications at Pearl Harbor? Why could not they land on the shore as well?

Mr. GARDNER. Many people have doubts whether the defenses of Pearl Harbor are sufficient.

To revert to this matter of the proposed alteration of the 12-inch guns. I am going to read from an article in the North American Review, written by one of the younger Coast Artillery officers. I am going to read from Lieut. Thompson's article, page 263, North American Review, for February, 1915. Here is what he says:

Should those in charge of gun construction determine to make the army 12-inch guns longer in range, with consequential loss of life to the gun and the great expense involved, it is doubtful whether our present carriages could withstand the strain caused by the additional powder charge and the higher angle of elevation required to make them compare in range with the latest 13, 14, and 15 inch guns of the maritime powers.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is you can not make over one of our 12-inch guns so as to be as good as the modern naval 15-inch guns, and it is folly to lull ourselves into the belief that the thing can be done.

Here is the report of the Breckinridge Board, December 19, 1914, and here is the last sentence:

The general policy with reference to seacoast defense should be to have an armament there emplaced of greater range and power than any which could be brought against it.

Instead of our armament having greater range and power it has less range and power. That is all there is to it.

WHY WERE THE ESTIMATES SO LOW?

The committee is contending that it has given the Army everything which the Secretary of War has asked for. It is true that Secretary Garrison has been given pretty nearly everything that he has asked for so far as the fortifications bill is concerned. May I call your attention to his reasons for asking for so little? He says, in the first place, that these estimates on which this bill was based were made out for the most part last March and submitted to him last spring. He had acted on practically all of them by June, long before the European war began. The Secretary says, on page 42 of the hearings:

If I were to make up the estimates now I should ask for more.

Again, on page 44, he says:

I do not feel now, in view of the state of the public revenue and in view of the state of the public necessities, that I should materially increase these estimates, notwithstanding the fact, as I say, that there has always existed a necessity for more precaution than we have ever taken in this country.

Even if the committee is giving the Secretary all he asked for in the estimates, that does not mean that the Army is being given what the officers have estimated as requisite. Take, for instance, the appropriation for field artillery in this bill. The Secretary's estimate was \$1,160,000 and the committee appropriated that amount. But that amount was very much less than Gen. Crozier estimated as necessary. He asked the Secretary of War to request the appropriation of \$3,000,000 for field artillery in this bill and \$3,000,000 for field artillery in the Army appropriation bill.

Turn to page 172 of the hearings and you will find that my assertion is true. Here is Gen. Crozier's testimony as to the amount of the Field Artillery estimates which he submitted to the Secretary of War:

Mr. CALDER. What I mean by that is, in presenting your case to the Secretary of War are these the amounts you asked for?

Gen. CROZIER. \$3,000,000 on each bill.

That is what the general asked the Secretary of War to approve. During the economy drought before the war in Europe broke out the estimate was cut to \$1,160,000.

SIXTEEN-INCH GUNS NEEDED.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that before long we must construct fortifications at Cape Henry. Is the War Department asking for those "just-as-good" 12-inch guns? It is not. Gen. Weaver has asked for 16-inch 50-caliber guns, and that is to be the standard of the future. Listen to this passage from the general's report as Chief of Coast Artillery:

In view of the fact that foreign warships of the latest design are to carry guns larger than 14 inches in caliber and of the highest ballistic power, and in view of the fact that if the defenses of Cape Henry were subjected to a naval attack it would be possible for a naval enemy to bring many battleships carrying 8 to 12 large-caliber guns per ship and to concentrate their fire on the Cape Henry fortifications * * * the Chief of Coast Artillery has recommended that the type gun for the Cape Henry fortifications be a 16-inch 50-caliber gun.

If these 12-inch guns which they are going to make into long-range guns by cocking them up a little higher and reducing the weight of the projectile—if these guns will then be all that Gen. Crozier's fancy paints them, then why is Gen. Weaver asking for 16-inch guns down at Cape Henry, and why are we installing 14-inch guns on the Panama Canal, at Corregidor Island, and in Honolulu?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Can the gentleman inform the committee what was the relative range of the forts in the island of Cuba as compared to the range of the American battleships? For instance, the range of the guns in Moro Castle at Habana and at San Juan, P. R., and at Santiago de Cuba?

Mr. GARDNER. Nobody ever tested that. I happened to be at Porto Rico. We landed far away from the forts. Nobody would have been fool enough to land under the guns of the San Juan fortifications when we could land anywhere we wished. As a matter of fact we landed at Ponce and Guyama and Guanica. It was the same way in Cuba. They had plenty of places to land. They picked out Daiquiri and effected a landing there.

Mr. KAHN. But there was an attack on the Moros?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, pshaw! They bombarded a mule or something or other down there.

Mr. KAHN. That was at Cardenas.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, at Cardenas.

THE FORTIFICATIONS.

I read from the report made in 1906 by the National Coast Defense Board, which was appointed January 31, 1905:

Strategically, Chesapeake Bay is, as it always has been, of the very first importance. With the entrance, as it is now, unfortified, a hostile fleet, should it gain control of the sea, can establish, without getting under the fire of a single gun, a base on its shores, pass in and out at pleasure, have access to large quantities of valuable supplies of all kinds, and the operation of the great trunk railway lines crossing the head of the bay.

That is what the National Coast Defense Board said nine years ago. That is the way the board pictured the military deficiencies of the sea approaches to Baltimore and Washington. Yet not one spadeful of earth has been turned to remedy that condition; not one spadeful. We have purchased some land at Cape Henry at the mouth of the bay, but further than that we have not gone. However, the ordnance and engineer officers recently presented to Secretary Garrison an estimate of the amount of money necessary to go ahead with the plans for constructing the defenses at Cape Henry. That estimate amounted to \$1,750,000 in round numbers. Principally on account of the condition of the Treasury, Secretary Garrison declined to submit this sum to Congress as a supplemental estimate. I admit that it would have been useless to recommend a part of that sum. Unless he recommended the whole million and three-quarters dollars, it was no use recommending anything at all, or so the Army officers said. What the Secretary ought to have done was to recommend every cent of that estimate. In December of 1912, Gen. Leonard Wood, in response to a question by Mr. SHERLEY, in the hearings on the fortifications bill on page 13, December 11, 1912, testified as follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I read from the hearings:

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been testified heretofore that so far as the continental United States was concerned we were not only adequately fortified, but in many instances overfortified?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. And you concur in that general proposition?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mind you, it was before the big 15-inch guns were mounted on foreign vessels that Gen. Wood gave that testimony. Moreover, he had no sooner said "Yes, sir," than he gave a long list of works yet to be undertaken in order to complete our necessary fortifications. The whole context shows that what Gen. Wood meant was that in certain places we had more guns than were necessary. He did not go into the question of the quality or range of the guns. The table which he presented that very day shows that he could not have meant that we had all the fortifications that were necessary. I have called attention to Gen. Wood's words because it is on that evidence that our opponents in part rely to confute our claim that more fortifications are imperative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand the gentleman from New York desires to yield some time to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. CALDER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky expect to have several speeches?

Mr. SHERLEY. I doubt whether there will be more than one or two short speeches on this side, with the exception of my own. May I ask the Chair what the status of the time now is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 hours and 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much has the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 1 hour and 33 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I can use a little time.

Mr. CALDER. I will use some time if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Just as the gentleman pleases.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration makes appropriations for the fortification of our continental coasts and our insular possessions. It also carries appropriations for field artillery, for our present organization and for reserve purposes, and for ammunition, supplies, and reserves for coast and field guns of all classes.

The committee recommends the expenditure during the next fiscal year of a little more than \$6,000,000 for these purposes, the same being about \$130,000 less than the amount of the estimates. I shall support the committee in its recommendation, because I am of the opinion that there is nothing in the present situation warranting an increase above the estimates. I am not, however, fully persuaded that the War Department would not have been justified in increasing its estimates for field artillery in view of its apparently relatively increased importance as a factor of modern war.

This is the last of the supply bills to be passed by the House dealing with military and war establishments, and I congratulate the House on not having been swept off its feet by the clamor and insistence of those who cite the present unfortunate conditions in Europe as a reason or excuse for greatly increased military and war expenditures.

Much as we desire peace, we all realize the necessity of reasonable preparation for war, and we only differ in our view as to what constitutes reasonable preparation under present conditions. I am one of those who believe that while we should not ignore prevailing conditions in the world and while we should take any extra precautions and make any extra provision within reason which that situation may clearly and unmistakably demand, we should by our policy make it very clear that we do not propose to allow the conditions of war abroad to hurry or stampede us into the adoption of a policy of vast and exhaustive military preparation. It is rather our duty in the present crisis to accentuate our position as a nonmilitary peace-loving power.

Whatever may be one's opinion as to the kind of a military establishment we ought to maintain, or the amount of money we should spend upon it, it can not be truthfully said we have been niggardly in our appropriations, having appropriated for those purposes for the years 1905 to 1916, inclusive, \$2,754,653,652.17, as follows:

Army (1905-1916)	\$1,056,992,311.88
Armories and arsenals (1905-1914)	5,573,725.00
Military posts (1905-1914)	19,108,127.50
Deficiency acts (military establishment, 1905-1914)	24,338,943.67
Naval Establishment (1905-1916)	1,557,063,534.31
Military Academy (1905-1916)	15,838,755.91
Fortifications (1905-1916)	75,738,253.90

Grand total..... 2,754,653,652.17

Army appropriation acts, fiscal years 1905-1916.

1905	\$77,070,300.88
1906	70,396,631.64
1907	71,817,165.08
1908	78,634,582.75
1909	95,382,247.61
1910	101,195,883.34
1911	95,440,567.55
1912	93,374,755.97
1913	90,958,712.98
1914	94,266,145.51
1915	94,241,145.51
1916 (as reported to House)	94,214,173.06

Grand total..... 1,056,992,311.88

Naval Establishment appropriations, 1905-1916.

1905 (58-3)	\$115,420,997.75
1906 (59-1)	104,508,719.88
1907 (59-2)	99,693,298.32
1908 (60-1)	129,974,371.95
1909 (60-2)	139,216,545.02
1910 (61-2)	133,555,552.88
1911 (61-3)	127,026,100.00
1912 (62-2)	123,024,783.27
1913 (62-3)	142,071,725.92
1914 (63-1)	147,212,935.88
1915 (63-2)	145,868,716.61
1916 (63-3) (as reported)	148,589,786.88

Grand total..... 1,557,063,534.31

Military Academy appropriation acts, fiscal years 1905-1916.

1905	\$973,947.26
1906	673,713.38
1907	1,664,707.67
1908	1,929,703.42
1909	845,634.87
1910	2,531,521.33
1911	1,856,249.87
1912	1,163,424.07
1913	1,064,668.26
1914	1,099,302.87

Total..... 13,802,873.00

1915	\$997,899.54
1916 (as reported to House)	1,037,933.37
Grand total	15,838,755.91
<i>Fortification appropriation acts, 1905-1916.</i>	
1905	\$7,518,192.00
1906	6,747,893.00
1907	5,053,993.00
1908	6,898,011.00
1909	9,316,745.00
1910	8,170,111.00
1911	5,617,200.00
1912	5,473,707.00
1913	4,036,235.00
1914	5,218,250.00
Total	64,050,337.00
1915	5,627,700.00
1916	6,060,216.90
Grand total	75,738,253.90

In detail our appropriation for these purposes, exclusive of armories and arsenals, military posts, and for various military purposes in deficiency acts totaling about \$49,000,000 for the period, have been as follows:

Army, Navy, Military Academy, and fortifications appropriations for each year from 1905 to 1916, inclusive (exclusive of sundry civil bill appropriations for armories and arsenals and military posts and deficiency appropriations for Military Establishment amounting to \$49,219,786.71).

1905	\$200,983,437.89
1906	182,326,957.85
1907	178,230,164.07
1908	217,436,660.12
1909	244,761,167.50
1910	245,453,068.55
1911	229,940,117.42
1912	223,936,670.31
1913	238,131,342.16
1914	247,796,634.26
1915	246,735,461.66
1916 (as reported to House)	249,902,160.21

If we are as unprepared as some would have us believe, it certainly is not because we have not appropriated large sums of money.

BAITING OF JAPAN.

Speaking of preparation for the possibility of misunderstandings with foreign powers, I am reminded that there is one kind of preparation which those who most clamor for vast military and naval establishments seem to hold in light esteem, though in my opinion it is the best of all insurance against and the most effective preventive of war: I refer to the maintenance of open-mindedness and good will, of candor and consideration, of the confidence which begets confidence, in our attitude, not only as a Nation but also as individuals, toward the nations and the peoples of the world.

The Constitution of the United States limits treason to acts of war against the United States or the adherence to and the giving of aid and comfort to its enemies. If it is treason in law to make war against one's country, is it not treason in essence to increase the liability of war by constantly reiterating the possibility and prophesying the probability of war? If it is treason in law to give aid and comfort to the enemies of one's country, is it not treason in substance to constantly proclaim that certain other nations and peoples, who have never given the slightest evidence of hostile intent, are inevitably destined and covertly inclined to engage us in hostilities?

Some of those who, for reasons best known to themselves, indulge in what I am constrained to consider treasonable baiting of foreign peoples make a specialty of continually proclaiming the probability or the certainty, as they put it, of an armed struggle some time in the future, near or remote, between our country and Japan. Such people are fortunately few in number, but what they lack in number they make up in clamor and persistency. In my humble opinion these declarations and those who make them can not be too severely condemned. If their assertion had any basis, their reiteration could serve no good purpose. If a conflict between Japan and this country some time in the future, near or remote, were as inevitable as these alarmists would have us believe, it could not be avoided, and therefore no good purpose would be served by harrowing up men's souls in advance in regard to them.

If the theory of these bellicose and bloodthirsty gentlemen has been that they were performing a public service by attempting to rush the country into feverish and gigantic preparations for the conflict they prophesy, they ought by this time to have become convinced that their efforts and their labors are in vain, for the people have steadily refused to take them seriously or to approve the ambitious plans of military preparation which they seek to promote by alarms which would be shriekingly ridiculous if they were not profoundly mischievous.

We have had, and no doubt will continue to have, problems and questions with the Government and people of Japan, as we

have with other Governments and peoples, which are more or less trying and vexatious. But no questions have arisen, none are likely to arise, that can not and will not be settled peacefully by the exercise of a reasonable amount of patience and good judgment by the people and the Governments of the two nations. We have no plans or ambitions for the future—so far as we know Japan has none—which will afford any reason or excuse for a clash of interests that can not be readily adjusted through diplomatic channels. Therefore I fail to see the slightest reason or excuse for the periodical fulminations of the gentlemen who afflict their nightmares on a long-suffering public.

Our people have been so little disturbed by, and have paid so little attention to, these outbreaks of warning against the "yellow peril" that we might all of us treat them with the amused tolerance with which they are ordinarily received if it were not for the fact that this sort of agitation, kept up long enough and reiterated with sufficient frequency, must eventually have some effect, and that harmful and mischievous to the last degree. I have known evil-minded or empty-headed people to get an entire neighborhood by the ears by the wicked or silly magnifying of trifling disagreements or by inflaming latent prejudices. Little Johnnie Jones and Billy Smith, naturally and usually friendly, may by the frequent interference of fools or busybodies be gradually led to magnify their minor differences and disagreements into causes for belligerence and permanent estrangement. The best of neighbors will eventually quarrel if each is sufficiently urged that a quarrel between them is inevitable.

As it is with individuals and communities, so it is with nations. Constant suggestion, frequent assertion, everlasting reiteration by those able to reach the public ear that two nations have aspirations and ambitions, plans and purposes which are irreconcilable and will not admit of adjustment by peaceful means, will eventually create a state of mind among both peoples in which the most trifling incident may light the spark of suspicion thus engendered and embroil nations which have no real inclination, reason, or even excuse for hostility in bloody and disastrous conflicts. It is this possible lamentable effect of the recital of these nightmares of apprehension, these groundless forebodings of hostilities, which take them out of the category of harmless vaporings, to be tolerated with good nature, and render them to them menaces to the public weal, which, while beyond the reach of statute, should receive condign punishment at the bar of public opinion.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MEXICO.

Fortunately these utterances have been wholly on individual responsibility. The attitude of our Government, so far as I am advised, has been frank, friendly, and correct. The same can not, I regret to say, be said in regard to the attitude of our Government under this administration toward our neighboring Republic on the south, relative to which I wish to submit a few observations.

On the 27th of this month one year will have elapsed since I made my first speech in the House criticizing the attitude of the administration toward the Government and the people of Mexico. At that time the administration had had a little more than a year in which to determine upon, advance, and carry forward its policy toward our neighboring Republic. That speech, temperate though it was, was roundly assailed on the other side of the Chamber as an impertinent attempt to call into question the acts of the President in exercising his constitutional authority in dealing with foreign affairs; and even on this side there were gentlemen who, hoping that by some chance or other the unhappy situation in Mexico might mend, doubted the wisdom of discussing the matter at that particular juncture. Later in the session and at various times, particularly on March 3, April 20, April 27, May 21, July 14 and 15, I addressed myself to various phases of our relations with and policy toward Mexico and the warring factions there.

During the period covered by these addresses it became increasingly apparent to all careful observers and thoughtful students of affairs in Mexico, and the acts and the attitude of our administration toward them, that things were going from bad to worse down there and that the administration's policy and lack of policy were becoming more and more untenable and indefensible. And yet through it all so generous is the attitude of the American people, and properly so, toward the dealings of their Government with foreign powers, so hazy was the public mind with regard to the real situation in Mexico, and the actual facts with regard to our relations to them and to the various factions, and above all so keen was the public hope that in some way or other peace and order would be restored without the necessity of extensive, expensive, or prolonged acts of intervention, that the average citizen was inclined to with-

hold censure of acts and policies that he could not and did not wholly approve.

This was the frame of the public mind when, just before the general elections last fall, with the overthrow of Huerta there came a temporary brief cessation of hostilities on a large scale, followed by the prompt issuance of the Democratic campaign book, with its fervent and flamboyant praise and eulogy of the President for the alleged restoration of peace and order in Mexico. Whether it was due to a promise to try to be good until after our election, or to a satiety of murder and plunder, on the part of those who had been the recipients of the administration's favors and the beneficiaries of its policy, that brought about a brief welcome respite from the more pronounced and flagrant atrocities, I do not know, but, as was inevitable, this break in the saturnalia of bloodletting and rapine was only temporary.

In the last few months the scenes and characters of the tragedy being enacted in Mexico have shifted and changed with bewildering rapidity. Presidents, generalissimos, and first chiefs have appeared in the spot light for a brief moment, to be rudely jostled and displaced by other aspiring candidates for brief and questionable notoriety and authority. Meanwhile the play has been constantly enlivened by a kaleidoscopic succession of scenes of major and minor rapine, pillage, and outrage. Above and over all has echoed and resounded the orchestra accompaniment of infantry and artillery fire and the repeated volleyings of murderous firing squads.

At least four, and nobody knows how many more, individuals are now claiming, as President, first chief, or commander, primacy in this drama of anarchy and chaos, while innumerable lesser villains are valiantly contributing their share to complete the picture of desolation and despair. With industry paralyzed, commerce suspended, homes desolated, cities despoiled, ranches ruined, fields uncultivated, her citizenship plundered, hunted, and terrorized, Mexico lies bleeding in the midst of anarchy, her people menaced by pestilence and facing starvation.

These deplorable conditions in Mexico are at last universally recognized and admitted, and more and more the part which our policy has played in producing them is being realized. From an attitude of a patient tolerance with the blunders of the administration's policy our people have gradually passed through a period of apology for the administration's policy to one of clear and well-nigh universal disapproval and criticism of it. None seek to defend, but few to apologize for what has been done and left undone in our dealings with Mexico, while from every quarter are heard expressions of regret, criticism, or condemnation.

In this state of affairs I am not particularly disposed to further emphasize or accentuate the now well-nigh universal disapproval of the administration's policy toward Mexico. I am not even disposed to assume the attitude of one who with the best of reason might, in the light of the present situation, very properly say, "I told you so." My only object in discussing the Mexican situation at this time is to point out and accentuate the fact that present conditions in Mexico, so far as the attitude of our administration has affected and produced them, is not due to any fluke or mischance of hard luck or adverse fortune, but is the inevitable result and consequence of a policy which was unwise, un-American, vicious, and indefensible from the start. The evil consequences which have followed have merely come as a logical and inevitable effect.

In the address which I made on February 27 last on this subject I expressed regret that my duty, as I saw and understood it, constrained me to criticize the administration in a matter relating to our foreign intercourse and relations. I stated that I was only persuaded to do so because I felt that the policy which the administration was pursuing did not afford "any substantial ground of hope or element of promise of improvement or solution of the conditions and problems" which confronted us in Mexico. I further stated that I was "persuaded that the acts and attitude of our Government have had the effect of prolonging and extending the lamentable condition of appalling disorder and distress which prevail in Mexico; that the continuation of our present policy, or lack of policy, tends to retard indefinitely the establishment of orderly conditions and constitutional government." I further stated on that occasion that as bad as conditions were in Mexico they would, "in my opinion, be infinitely worse if the aims and objects apparently desired by our administration shall be accomplished," and I expressed the belief that under the policy that we were following "the reign of rape and rapine, of plunder and murder that have desolated northern Mexico and set it back a generation in civilization and development will spread all over that fair land."

In a former discussion of the Mexican situation I expressed the opinion that the inevitable outcome in Mexico, owing largely to the attitude and acts of our Government, would be that the country, after being successively devastated by the armies of the different factions, would become the prey of a number of rival leaders, each of whom would, in his own sphere, when not engaged in fighting the others, busy himself with exhausting, for his individual benefit and that of his immediate followers, the accumulations and the resources of the particular territory over which he held brutal and despotic sway. All these things have come true, and yet I am not a prophet or a son of a prophet. I was merely stating in advance the inevitable effect of causes our policy helped set in motion and advanced in the accomplishment of their logical effect. I have no desire to weary the House with a repetition of what I have heretofore said with regard to our policy and its probable result, and I shall only review the matter briefly for the purpose of refreshing your recollection as to certain features of the administration's policies, and again point out their fatal error, in order to emphasize the fact that what has happened is only what could have been reasonably expected.

In an address which I delivered on April 3 last in Philadelphia, before the American Association of Political and Social Science, and which appears on page 350 of the Appendix to the Record of last session, I reviewed the historic policy of our Government in dealing with foreign powers, and particularly with other American States, under conditions similar to those which then confronted this administration. I then called attention to the fact that it had ever been our policy in dealing with these nations, while avoiding scrupulously the espousal of the cause of any one faction as against another, to endeavor to maintain correct diplomatic relations with the de facto Government without regard to its character or its personnel.

The very first important act of this administration in its relations "with those exercising authority in Mexico" constituted a complete reversal of our time-honored policy and constituted an affront to the dignity of Mexico as an independent sovereignty. In his demands upon and his communications with "those exercising authority in Mexico" the President early erred in three important particulars—first, in declining to establish regular official relations with the de facto Government in Mexico and in treating with those whom he described as "exercising authority in Mexico" irregularly and personally; second, in demanding the removal of the head of the de facto Government; third, in a variety of ways, officially and unofficially, directly and indirectly, openly and covertly, aiding and encouraging a faction of the forces operating against the de facto Government. The first of these errors substituted personal for official management in our relations with Mexico; the second challenged Mexico's independence and sovereignty; the third was an act of indirect intervention which culminated in war—a little war, it is true, but a war, nevertheless.

It does not excuse our inexcusable policy that it was in all probability drifted into rather than definitely determined upon. Rumor has it that at the beginning of the administration it was assumed, if not determined, in the Department of State that after a sufficient time had elapsed to emphasize the abhorrence and the disapproval of our Government and people of the assassinations which immediately followed the establishment of the Huerta government our Government would, accepting the fact and the situation, recognize the Huerta régime as the de facto authority in Mexico. It was realized and understood that this recognition, if too long delayed, might lead to acts or expressions by those "exercising authority in Mexico" which would embarrass us in extending that recognition.

The situation was one, therefore, demanding close attention and careful and diplomatic treatment. But the crucial moment, so it is said, approached, arrived, and passed while the Secretary of State filled lecture engagements. Observations were made, so it is said, by the head of the de facto government in Mexico and opinions were expressed by him relative to our acts and policy toward that government which did not set well with our Chief Executive, and then and there was determined the purely personal policy of hostility against the head of the de facto government, of interference with the affairs of Mexico, and of indirect intervention in behalf of one of the warring factions.

What has happened is the inevitable, the logical result of the attitude thus assumed, an attitude of insult to the sovereignty of Mexico, an attitude disintegrating and trouble breeding in its effect. Our refusal to deal directly and officially with the de facto government, on the theory that Mexico was independent and sovereign, precludes the possibility of our recognizing, now or in the future, any de facto government that does not subject itself to

or meet the preposterous condition that we, or, rather, our President, shall judge the constitutional character of the de facto government. This policy and attitude deprive any government established in Mexico of that recognition by foreign powers which is a helpful, if not an essential, aid to the establishment of peace and order so long as there are any aspiring chieftains able to retain control of any considerable territory or population in Mexico.

Not only has the policy thus pursued retarded the establishment of peace, but it has rendered us well-nigh helpless in the protection of the persons and property of our citizens. Our policy has likewise rendered us impotent and ineffectual in fulfilling our duties and responsibilities toward other nations and their citizens, duties devolving upon us as Mexico's nearest and most powerful neighbor and solemnly assumed by us under the Monroe doctrine. Hundreds of Americans have lost their lives, thousands have been insulted, despoiled, and outraged, and the property of Americans running into the hundreds of millions has been destroyed or rendered valueless. The nationals of other countries, more particularly those of Spain, who have relied upon us because we assumed responsibility for them, have suffered outrage, indignity, and death. Foreign property, especially that of Spaniards, has been confiscated, looted, or destroyed. We stand before the bar of public opinion of the world condemned for our failure to meet and live up to responsibilities we have ourselves assumed.

The only answer or excuse made or offered on this floor or elsewhere for our failure and dereliction has been in the false claim that the President has preserved peace with Mexico. The President has not maintained peace between the United States and Mexico. He inaugurated and carried on a war which but for the weakness of the de facto government in Mexico would have been long and bloody and which, except for the splendid gallantry and heroism of our soldiers and sailors, was as inglorious as it was brief.

The oft-reiterated declaration on this floor and elsewhere that the President preserved peace with Mexico while the Republicans were clamoring for war is as silly as it is untrue. No one on this floor, no one in a position of responsibility anywhere, so far as I know, has desired or demanded war with Mexico. I certainly have not. I did not approve the little war we had. I have never believed that intervention was necessary or desirable. We might have avoided the loss of \$15,000,000 and a score of gallant lives at Vera Cruz or we might have made that sacrifice of some value by holding or extending our control.

There was a way to measurably protect our people and their property in Mexico, and to have reasonably, probably satisfactorily, fulfilled our obligations to other countries and their citizens without intervention and without further expense than that of holding as we have done a considerable body of troops on the Mexican border.

Had we followed our time-honored policy and in due and proper course recognized the Huerta government as the de facto government in Mexico, or merely recognized that government as the government in control of that portion of Mexico, and made no demands upon it other than the protection of the lives and property of our citizens and those of other nations we should have had the good will of that government and the people friendly to it, and the lives and property of our citizens and other foreigners would have been respected and protected. As a matter of fact, Americans and other foreigners were protected in their persons and in their property by that government in spite of our indefensible attitude toward it.

If, further, we had remained neutral toward the warring factions in northern Mexico, had treated them without fear and without favor and laid upon them the single injunction and condition that in their conflict with the Huerta government they must see to it that the persons of our citizens and of other foreigners were respected and their property protected as far as possible under the conditions of war which existed, had we made it clear to Villa and Carranza that any failure to afford this respect and protection would be swiftly followed by the advance of our forces across the border, and that failure to punish promptly outrage or destruction, which might occur in spite of efforts to prevent it, would be followed by a swift and effective blow, we would, in my opinion, have had little reason for complaint.

One time and another the President has said some very extraordinary things about Mexico and his policy in dealing with that country and people, but the most remarkable of all his utterances on the subject are contained in the very peculiar speech which he made at Indianapolis on Jackson Day. Among other things the President said:

I hold it as a fundamental principle, and so do you, that every people has the right to determine its own form of government.

It is curious that the President had forgotten or overlooked this fundamental principle when he assumed the right to tell the people of Mexico through John Lind what kind of a government they should have. The claim the President then made that he, and not the people of Mexico, had the right to say what sort of a government they should have and who should be at the head of it, was the basis and the beginning of the administration's blunders and errors in Mexico.

The President further uttered the very obvious truth, "The country is theirs. The government is theirs." And then, as though to valiantly ward off some evil-minded intermeddler, he declared with emphasis "and so far as my influence goes while I am President nobody shall interfere with them." Nobody has been interfering with them but the President, and he has interfered with them and with their affairs directly and indirectly and has brought to the support of that interference the Army, the Navy, and all the moral and political influences of a great nation. Probably what the President meant was that he did not intend to have anyone interfere with Mexico but himself. That is evident enough. Persistent rumor has it that our interests in the Panama Canal were put in jeopardy, if not surrendered, in order that the President might have a free hand to interfere with Mexico in just the way he desired.

Perhaps the most extraordinary statement which the President made at Indianapolis was, "If I am strong I am ashamed to bully the weak." This expression leads me to hope that the President is regretting the way he bullied the Huerta government and the people of Mexico who were favorable to that government. Finally, the President said that he thought the Mexicans should have just as long as they wanted for blood-letting and to settle their affairs. To all of which, with certain reservations, we say, "Amen." But why did not the President think about that and take that view of the matter 18 months ago, when he was setting himself up as a dictator over Mexican affairs? Extraordinary as it may seem, the one feature of the situation which is primarily our affair, with regard to which it is our right and our duty to have much to say and to say it with emphasis, the President entirely ignored in his Indianapolis speech. He made no reference whatever to our right and our duty to demand and enforce the protection of our citizens and the citizens of other nations, responsibility for whom we had assumed.

The people of Mexico have a right to the sort of government they desire. They have the right to have at the head of that government whoever they please or whoever they shall tolerate. They have the right to quarrel among themselves as much as they please. These rights which the President now asserts, as though some one else were denying them, he himself denied. On the other hand, we have a right, it is our duty, to demand and secure protection for the persons and property of those for whom we are responsible, but we have failed utterly so to do. For the first time in a large and important affair of our foreign relations the policy adopted and followed has been one of continuous blunders, of profound and lamentable error and bad judgment. We have neither protected our own people nor the people of other nations we were pledged to protect. Every American in Mexico has been disappointed and humiliated by our acts and attitude. Foreign Governments can not help feeling contempt for our failure to perform our duty toward their citizens. If we have a friend or well-wisher left among all the warring factions in Mexico, he has not been heard from. We have finally excluded ourselves in a large measure from even the uncertain and unofficial relationships our Government for a long time maintained with the various factions in Mexico, and are therefore more than ever helpless to extend protection or exercise influence amid the reign of chaos and anarchy. This, then, is the sorry outcome, the sad and lamentable effect, of the policy which our administration and its supporters have so proudly and hopefully proclaimed. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, 35 years ago I went out from a small denominational college in South Carolina. There are other institutions of higher literary standard, but nowhere on this earth is there an institution where the moral and religious atmosphere is better. On the occasion of my graduation from that institution the subject of my discourse was the advocacy of an international court that would try differences between nations as courts in all civilized countries adjust differences between individuals. I live in the hope that the day will come when there will be a great court for all the nations of the earth, presided over by men of such distinguished ability and character that its judgments will be respected and enforced just as the decrees and judgments of the courts of

civilized countries are to-day. I am sorry that at this time the great newspapers and magazines of this country have assumed the attitude they have. If the great metropolitan dailies and the magazines would devote one-half of the space to preaching peace on earth and a higher civilization and Christianity among men that they now devote to trying to scare the American people and the American Congress into great appropriations for the Army and Navy they would render a distinct service to human kind. [Applause.] I looked over one of the great papers this morning and there were three separate articles intended to inflame the minds of the people and to excite the Congress to make larger appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are making progress. The Congress has not been swept off its feet to the extent some gentlemen hoped, and while our progress to a higher civilization and a higher enlightenment is not as rapid as some of us would like to see it, we are still making progress. There was a time in the history of Massachusetts when the people believed in witches. There was a time when the people lay awake at night studying about plans and methods to protect themselves against the witches, because it was said that the witches could come through the keyholes and get into rooms in all kinds of ways. We have departed from such superstitions as that, and we look back in amazement now that an intelligent people should ever have believed in such nonsense. I can remember when the dueling code was quite the thing. Do gentlemen around me now remember that at one time in our history it was common for public men, when they felt that their dignity and their honor had been assailed, to insist that there was but one way to defend that honor, and that way was to meet their opponent at 10 or 20 paces and shoot it out? We are getting away from that sort of false sense of honor. We are getting away from that sort of civilization. We are getting away from that sort of barbarism; and we live in the hope that the day will come when our people will look back in absolute amazement and astonishment at such arguments as have been made on this floor about war and the preparation for war. I want to enshrine in this RECORD my idea of civilization for the benefit of my children and other children who shall come after. It is such speeches as have been made in this House and on the stump, when printed in the newspapers, that are intended to stir people, to excite the people, and they may do incalculable harm. They remind me of telling a child ghost stories in the dark. If you want to make a child perfectly miserable, sit down in the dark hours of the night and tell that child ghost stories, and then tell the child to go to a neighbor's house past a graveyard, or go upstairs and go to bed in the dark.

And these wild speeches that have been made in Congress and out of Congress, as I said a moment ago, are intended to have, and do have, just such an effect on timid people as the telling of ghost stories in the dark has on children. If there ever were a time in the history of this Republic when men ought to be talking peace, and men ought to be talking in favor of reducing these great appropriations for guns and ships, now is the time. [Applause.]

I believe when the war broke out in Europe last August and involved all the great warlike nations, the people were prepared to believe that every argument upon which we had based our previous appropriations for the Army and for the Navy had been proved to be false. We have been making these appropriations ever since I have been in Congress—14 years—upon the basis that preparedness insured peace. The war in Europe has demonstrated what some of us have believed all the time, that that was not true. It is no more true with nations than it is with individuals. A man who carries revolvers in his pocket is the man that gets into shooting scrapes, and not the fellow who does not. It is the nation that prepares for war that gets into war, and not the nations that do not, and that was clearly demonstrated by the war in Europe. The people would have reached that conclusion. Instantly there was such an agitation set up in this country, and such a propaganda as we have never had in your day or mine, in favor of increasing the appropriations. We are utterly unprepared, according to these wild statements that have been made. Then, if we are utterly unprepared, we have wasted untold hundreds of millions in the last 20 years. There is one of two things true, either the Army and the Navy men have squandered the money or have not used it in the proper way, because we have certainly appropriated money enough to put us in a state of defense.

I do not think this country is in any danger of war. It is possible that any man in our presence may be assassinated between this House and his home to-night, but it is so absolutely improbable that such a thing will happen that no man has little enough sense to sit here and worry about it until he

gets ready to start for home. So it is in regard to this country getting into war. It is possible, but it is so remotely improbable that nobody need to bother in thinking about it. Certainly not at this time, when all the great powers of the earth have all they can take care of on their hands now. Who is going to fight you now? Who is going to land in New York and actually take charge of the multimillionaires and lay a ransom of \$5,000,000,000 upon them? I saw a statement like that printed in a morning paper, taken from some article, book, or magazine written by one of these alarmists. There is no sense in that sort of talk. There are plenty of people in New York who are poor in this world's goods but who have the physical strength to take hold of one of these multimillionaires any day upon the street and rob him; but they do not do it, because this is a law-abiding country. And so no nation is going to try to land an army on our shores. What would they do it for?

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make this statement, relating somewhat to the bill now under consideration, because I have been hearing speeches ever since this session of Congress began that are so far from my idea of what our duty is in this emergency that I wanted to state what I believe ought to be done. I believe the great American Republic ought to take the lead of all the nations of the world and undertake to establish a higher civilization and a higher Christianity, undertake to establish a great court to settle the differences between the nations as differences between men are settled. [Applause.] I stand for peace in all the world and peace among all mankind. I may be in the minority now, but the doctrine which I preach will stand the test of analysis; it will stand before any tribunal where reason instead of passion and ignorance and superstition controls.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And it will stand in the court in the great hereafter when we all appear there.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Would he submit to that court the question of the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, I do not care to discuss the Monroe doctrine. The men who advocated the Monroe doctrine no more preached the kind of doctrine that the gentleman from Massachusetts is preaching than the Savior of the world preached the doctrine that we now hear on this floor. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JOHN FITCH.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a subject which is of special interest to Connecticut, and particularly to the first congressional district, which I have the honor to represent. In the interests of historical accuracy there is a strong sentiment in Connecticut in favor of according justice to an inventor whose genius gave mankind one of our most valuable inventions. I refer to John Fitch, a native of Connecticut.

The records compiled by Admiral Bunce Section, Navy League of the United States, Hartford, Conn., and historical works which I have at hand, prove clearly that the discovery, invention, and successful application of steam propulsion of vessels through water—the first in all history—belongs in all justice, honor, and of right to John Fitch, a native of Windsor (now South Windsor), State of Connecticut. Fitch's steamboat invention dates back to April, 1785. His practical drawings and models which showed the screw propeller, as well as paddles, were exhibited the same year to the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, Pa.

FITCH IN 1786.

In 1786, upon the petition of Fitch, New Jersey granted him sole and exclusive rights in her navigable waters for a period of 14 years for his steamboat invention. This original petition of Fitch, which was lost for many years, has been found recently—1914—by Adj. Gen. Wilbur F. Sadler, of New Jersey, and photographic copy of same forwarded to Connecticut.

In 1787 four other States, viz, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New York granted Fitch similar rights in their navigable waters for a period of 14 years for his steamboat invention. These grants to Fitch were made 20 years before Robert Fulton launched his first steamboat, the *Clermont*, on the Hudson River, in 1807.

In 1789 the United States National Government was formed, taking over the control of the navigable waters of the several States.

In 1791 the National Government granted Fitch letters patent for his steamboat invention for a period of 14 years.

In 1796 Fitch also constructed a steamboat out of a ship's yawl, moved by a screw propeller, upon the Collect Pond, New York City.

In 1798, nine years after control of navigable waters of New York had passed over to the National Government and seven years after the National Government had granted Fitch letters patent for his steamboat invention, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston petitioned the then Legislature of New York to repeal the act of 1787 which granted Fitch rights in the navigable waters of his State and to grant him, Livingston, similar rights in the navigable waters of New York. This extraordinary petition of Livingston for a limited period of 20 years was granted, notwithstanding New York had no navigable rights to grant to anybody, they having been passed over to the National Government in 1789.

In 1803, five years later, Livingston again petitioned the then Legislature of New York to extend these so-called rights in the navigable waters of this State to Robert Fulton.

NO "CLERMONT" TILL 1807.

Up to this date, 1803, Livingston's and Fulton's experiments in steam propulsion of vessels through water "had proved fruitless," and they asked this legislature to grant them two years more of time to determine the practicability of their experiments, which was granted, conditioned, however, that "if successful" these experiments should be submitted to a commission. Fulton's *Clermont* was not launched on the Hudson River until 1807.

In 1808 the then Legislature of New York granted Livingston and Fulton confiscatory penalties.

These so-called "rights" were exercised by Livingston and Fulton up to 1812, when they brought suit against Van Ingen and others for infringement of these "rights," and were sustained by the New York courts.

Some time after 1812 these "rights" were assigned to John R. Livingston, and he assigned them to Aaron Ogden, of New Jersey.

Ogden made memorial and petition to the then Legislature of New York of 1814, which was referred to a select committee to hear the controversy between John Fitch and Livingston and Fulton on priority of invention pertaining to steamboats, when claimants appeared by counsel, and on March 8, 1814, this committee reported that the Livingston and Fulton steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him in 1791 by the National Government of the United States.

Ogden then brought suit against Thomas Gibbons for infringement of these so-called "rights" obtained from Livingston and Fulton, and he—Ogden—was sustained by the New York courts, but which on appeal by Gibbons went to the Supreme Court of the United States and was heard at the February term, 1824. Daniel Webster appeared for the appellant, Gibbons. The United States Supreme Court reversed and annulled all these legislative grants made by New York to Livingston and Fulton, sustaining Mr. Webster's argument, that these legislative grants created a monopoly to Livingston and Fulton with "confiscatory penalties," which were hostile to all the other citizens of New York, hostile to the citizens of all the other States, and hostile to the sovereignty of the United States. This ended the Livingston and Fulton monopoly.

FULTON'S OWN ADMISSIONS.

In addition to the above, Fulton's own declarations are conclusive. In his letter to Lord Stanhope November, 1793, Fulton says:

In June, 1793, I began the experiments on the steamships. My first design was to imitate the spring in the tail of a salmon. For this purpose I supposed a large bow to be wound up by the steam engine and the collected force attached to the end of a paddle, as in No. 1, let off, would urge the vessel forward."

It was this identical year—1793—that Fulton borrowed from Mr. Vail, our consul at L'Orient, France, Fitch's drawings and specifications of the steamboat Fitch had been running on the Delaware River three, four, and five years before 1793, carrying passengers and making 7 to 8 miles an hour. Such was the beginning of Fulton's crude experiments in steam propulsion of vessels through water—by imitating the spring in the tail of a salmon, by use of a steam engine to wind up a bow attached to the end of a paddle, let off, would urge the vessel forward. And the ending came when in 1814 the select committee reported to the New York Legislature that the Fulton and Livingston steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him in 1791 by the National Government of the United States.

It seems incredible that the promoters of the Hudson-Fulton celebration, New York City, 1900, should have been ignorant of the facts of record in their own State, and especially that

the select committee appointed by the New York Legislature of 1814 on petition of Aaron Ogden, of New Jersey, reported that Livingston and Fulton's steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him by our National Government in 1791, and, further, that Fulton himself never claimed priority for steamboat invention, and still further that all the grants made by the Legislatures of the State of New York to Livingston and Fulton were reversed and annulled by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1824.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has now 1 hour and 57 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not now see anyone present on the floor to whom I have offered time. If the gentleman from New York desires to yield some time, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose only of printing a paper prepared some years ago by the Hon. S. D. Fess, of Ohio, giving the inside history of the writing of Washington's Farewell Address.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the RECORD the document indicated by him? Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approach any discussion of military matters with a great deal of diffidence. While military matters have always been attractive to me as to many another citizen and civilian, and probably have received more side study from me than any other subject in which I have ever been engaged, yet my own limitations are so vast that I do not feel like hazarding anything like judgment or expressing very much in the way of an opinion. Therefore I would not on this occasion offer any remarks at all did I not feel it necessary that something be said and that some expression be given to some features of our national defense that it seems never will be allowed to get out. I have no words whatever in the way of criticism of the committee that presents this bill, nor have I any words of criticism respecting the character of hearings which they had. I hope I make that emphatic. But I do think that at this particular time it is unfortunate that there was not had before the committee certain Army and, perhaps, Navy men of great military attainments, to give expression to their viewpoint on these matters of fundamental importance to the Nation. The committee had before it Gen. Weaver, the commanding officer of the Coast Artillery, and a splendid officer, Gen. Crozier, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, an officer of the very highest attainments, character, and honor, and the Secretary of War; and that is all. Those were the only ones of military training that were permitted to say a word on our Nation's defenses. It was only, as I assume, and I think I assume correctly, by reason of his battering-ram persistence that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] got before the committee and participated somewhat in the hearings.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman surely does not think it was on account of not naming officers that should be summoned that this omission to summon officers occurred? The gentleman does not suppose that I failed to furnish this committee with the names of officers that I would like to have summoned, as I did in the other committees?

Mr. MILLER. I am not certain of the facts, and yet it was my impression certainly, that, knowing the gentleman as I do, he made every possible effort—

Mr. GARDNER. I did.

Mr. MILLER (continuing). To have these men summoned and permitted to appear before this committee.

Mr. GARDNER. And I asked to have before this committee the Chief of Staff, Gen. Wood.

Mr. MILLER. Therefore, without posing as a military expert, but simply giving to the House the opinions that these military experts have given me, I offer the few remarks that I do on this occasion.

The first thing I want to speak about is the type of gun carriage with which our coast-defense guns are now mounted. I do not for a moment offer myself in the arena of discussion, often acrimonious, that has been had in years past over the Buffington-Crozier type of disappearing-gun carriage, but I do offer this, that the present type of disappearing-gun carriage in use generally in our coast fortifications is not adapted, and

can not be adapted, to large guns of long range. For certain very well-established reasons, not to mention the complexity of their structure, which is a very incidental feature after all, this type of gun carriage is not adapted to guns of large caliber. By reason of the mechanical nature of their structure—and their essential structure—they can not be made reasonably to cover what is known as all-around fire. I believe there are four or five guns, perhaps a few more, that have been constructed of that kind in our fortifications, but the number is infinitesimally small.

Now, I observe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] smiles. I do not doubt that he smiles. He thinks what I am saying is foolishness. I do not blame him at all, for the reason that he has obtained his knowledge and his information and his opinions from the same channels that have ever led in times past and still lead to the House of Representatives from the Military Establishment. Some of us on the outside have journeyed a little afield and have endeavored to get the information from the men who are serving the guns, from the men who are charged with the responsibility of standing up and shooting and being shot at if the shock of battle ever comes to our land.

In his own hearing Col. Winslow, not a military man, but an engineering officer of high rank, has stated, as the gentleman from Kentucky will recall, that the Crozier-Buffington disappearing gun carriage is not adapted, and his experience and observation and mechanical judgment go to show that it can not be well adapted, to all-around gunfire. Any attempt to construct that kind of an emplacement involves an expenditure of money that runs into enormous figures and practically destroys the safety zone for the men serving the guns. There is not a gun, so far as I know, mounted on our coast fortifications and now ready for use of a greater caliber than 12 inches. Recently, when the big guns of foreign navies were at work, the people of our Nation were aroused over the fact that our coast fortifications were not equipped with guns the equal in caliber and range of guns that might be brought to bear against them—guns that are in foreign navies of the world. I have no doubt but that that idea was accentuated when we read recently of the battle in the North Sea, where the British ship *Lion*, as I recall, or *Tiger*—one or the other—actually made effective hits at a range of 17,000 yards, while the maximum range of our 12-inch guns in our coast fortifications is only 14,000 yards with a projectile such as they call their heaviest or maximum size. From 12,000 to 14,000 yards was the reasonable average maximum distance those guns could be fired with effect.

Recognizing this, we find the recommendation made—and the subcommittee saw fit to act upon it—to make a 15 or 16 inch gun out of the 12-inch gun by pointing it up a little higher in the air. It is not proposed, so far as I understand, to increase the powder charge. If anything, they are going to make the projectile a little lighter in weight, so that it is not that they intend to make a heavier projectile.

Now, everybody knows that the striking force of any object depends upon the speed with which it goes and its weight. Is there any child in America old enough to have studied mathematics at all who thinks that a projectile of a given weight, fired with the same amount of ammunition, when it has traveled 20,000 yards will strike with the same effect and force that it would strike had it been fired at 12,000 yards? Everybody knows that as you increase the distance of the moving projectile you decrease its striking power. Therefore, its velocity being less and the weight of the projectile the same, the concussion is very much reduced.

I was quite amused to note some of the cocksure smugness of certain conversations or statements in the hearings, when it was said that, while we might have some disadvantage in pointing these guns up in the air, yet when the bullet or projectile came down it might strike, instead of on the side of the ship, on the top, and therefore have some of the force of a mortar—the vaporing thought of a man reaching for an excuse! You never can make a 15-inch gun out of a 12-inch gun, and everybody knows that.

I think I know one reason why guns of a larger caliber have not been made in the last two or three years, although we are making some of 14 inch, have mounted some in the insular possessions, and have some ready for the United States, while, in addition, it is proposed now to construct our main coast batteries of guns having 16-inch caliber. I believe it was Gen. Weaver, in the hearings, who said that in his opinion and that of the board that considered the matter recently, guns should be constructed for coast defenses of 16-inch caliber. Evidently none of them thought you could point a 12-inch gun a little higher in the air and thus make a 14, a 15, or a 16 inch gun out of it.

Now, I am not here advocating that we take down all of the 12-inch guns that we have and put in their place 14, 15, and

16 inch guns. Not at all. I am simply advocating that hereafter, in line with what Gen. Weaver has suggested, the guns that we build and hereafter mount shall be of larger caliber; and such guns, I do not believe, can be placed successfully upon a disappearing-gun carriage.

And I can give you in just a moment or two my reasons for that belief. Several years ago, when I visited one of the fortresses of the United States, like anyone would be, I was interested in the big guns. I had a captain of a battery explain them to me somewhat in detail. He was a most efficient officer. I will say to you that this fortification is the strongest in continental United States. I was admiring, with American enthusiasm, the disappearing-gun carriage, and I asked him if it were not superior to all of the other gun carriages in the world, if any other nation had anything like that which we possessed, if this did not give us a superior position over any of the other nations of the world; and he laughed. He said that for a gun no greater than 10 inches it was fine, but that for 12 inches it was far inferior to the barbette type. I thought perhaps he was an isolated individual; that perhaps he was a crank; that possibly he did not express the opinion of his brother officers. So from that day until the present, every time I have visited a fort—and I have visited a great many in the United States and outside in our insular possessions—I have sought out the Coast Artillery officers, and I have asked the question, "For 12-inch and larger guns is the disappearing-gun carriage that we now have better or as good as the barbette or turret type?" I want to say to you that of all the men I have asked I have never found a man who failed to say that the present disappearing-gun carriage is inferior to the barbette or the turret type. They told me that when it comes to the matter of safety to the man, which is one of the important features advocated by those who favor this type of gun carriage, when you come to a gun of the size of 12 inches or greater, the distance the gun is compelled to move back into the emplacement is so great that the safety space is materially lessened, and the protection is probably no greater, if it is as great as in the barbette type.

But to my mind this is the greatest feature of all: They tell me that for a 12-inch gun or gun of larger size the disappearing type is of comparatively slow fire. I was surprised when I heard that, because I had heard it said that one of the great things in favor of the disappearing-gun carriage was that the recoil of the discharge of the gun sent it back right where the ammunition was and that the shell could be rammed in, and by the time the gun got back up it was ready for firing. Now, I have read the essays of several of the Army officers comparing the two types of carriage. There are elements of time saved by both systems, and some of the officers say one about balances the other for the smaller guns. But we are confronted with this fact: The highest speed with which a 12-inch gun has been fired in the history of our fortifications is a little less than two shots a minute—about one and three-quarters a minute—and the maximum speed that is fixed by the Chief of Artillery in the hearings as a basis for the number of rounds for a two-hour engagement is 45 seconds, or two shots in a minute and a half. We are confronted with the fact that in all of the navies of the world, so far as I know, the 12-inch guns are being fired from six to ten times a minute. Therefore one gun with the barbette carriage, with the proper methods of loading it, would be equal to about three of the disappearing type.

I want to confess and admit that in many of the tests that are now had it is shown that by our present system of loading in the barbette type the speed is probably not much greater, if it is as great as with the disappearing carriage. But there has been no change for 30 years in the method of elevating the ammunition to the gun in the barbette type. Every other nation in the world has, by mechanical devices, revolutionized that system, and we can do it ourselves in one month's time if we will but set our minds to it.

I found one thing more. I found that military men in the Coast Artillery Service lamented the fact that the muzzle velocity of our coast artillery has been lowered from 2,550 feet per second, as it was a few years ago, to 2,250 feet per second, as it is now. This is in spite of the fact that all the other nations in the world, in their coast artillery and in their navies, have increased the muzzle velocity of their guns, until now in England it is 3,000 feet per second and in Germany 3,080 feet per second, while we, in the grand old United States of America, have dropped down to 2,250. Food for thought! I inquired why this was. Not all answered. Most said they did not know, but those who did answer said that in their judgment our Ordnance Department was afraid of the disappearing-gun carriage, and that the muzzle velocity had been lowered to save the carriage.

Now, if some of these things are true, if any of them are true, the subject ought to be and ought to have been investigated. These younger men who are actively in the work of manning these fortifications, who are engaged in the actual work of handling these guns, ought to have an opportunity to express their views, which opportunity has not been given in this Congress, and so far as I know has not been given for a great many years past, and the only reason why I say they ought to have been given an opportunity at this session is because the subject is now a live one, more alive perhaps than it has been for a long period of time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said, and I agree with him with reference to the Buffington-Crozier carriage; but I was under the impression that the reason why the muzzle velocity had been lowered was because of the fact that the greater the muzzle velocity the greater the amount of erosion of the rifling of the gun, and that it had been found that the high velocity had resulted in shortening the life of the gun, bringing about its early destruction—that is, bringing about such inaccuracy that after a certain number of rounds it was of no practical value.

Mr. MILLER. I am not certain as to that. I will say, however, that I have heard it stated by the officers in the Coast Artillery Corps that they had been told that the reason why the decrease had been made in the muzzle velocity was because of the erosion, but that they did not believe that was the primary reason.

I think, however, it is natural to assume, and we must admit, that there would be some decrease in the erosion by decreasing the speed at which the projectile is fired. Even a nonmilitary man like myself can recognize that. But if that is the reason, why have all the other nations of the world increased the muzzle velocity of their big cannon? The answer is that efficiency is the supreme test, and apparently we have journeyed far backward in efficiency while other nations have advanced.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not a fact that it was Gen. Crozier himself who testified in the hearings that the guns would wear out in much less than 300 shots if they had a higher velocity than 2,250 feet; was it not Gen. Crozier defending his own pieces?

Mr. MILLER. I think that is entirely true. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], a short time ago when the gentleman from Massachusetts was speaking, asked him something in reference to mortars, and the gentleman from Massachusetts replied, giving some account of the making of mortars and what the mortar was expected to do; and in response to a further question, he said that in Hawaii it had been found necessary to at least suggest some land defense to protect Pearl Harbor. Now, I am very frank to say that I do not think much of anybody who talks out of school; I do not know whether I am talking out of school or not. I desired to have these matters submitted to the subcommittee in charge of this bill, but for some reason or other opportunity was not given, and this is the only chance I have got, and I am going to use it now.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did the gentleman from Minnesota himself ask to appear before our committee?

Mr. MILLER. Not myself. I asked that military men might be summoned and their testimony had. I would not presume to appear before any committee and give them suggestions in matters military.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman suggested once to me about an artillery officer stationed in Manila, but with that exception did he ever make a request to summon any other officer?

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is not quite accurate; I suggested that on two occasions. The gentleman may not recall both times. I suggested to him that there were matters of grave importance connected with the insular defenses, and the man who had charge of the construction was in the War College, and I thought he ought to be summoned before the committee and his testimony had. The gentleman from Kentucky on this occasion said that he would consider it. Thereafter when I thought the hearings were about to begin I went over on the Democratic side and made the suggestion again. Now, I am willing to say that the gentleman from Kentucky may have been preoccupied—he may have had something on his mind—but on account of the treatment I then received I thought it was not wise to make the request any further.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is aware that I said a few moments ago that I was not conscious of any such treatment.

Mr. MILLER. That is true.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say now that my impression is that I spoke about the matter having been sent to the War Department and having been considered there.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to admit that the gentleman might have been preoccupied, but the reception was not such that I thought it wise to pursue the subject further.

Now, I want to say something about Hawaii. I was in Hawaii in the hour when the Japanese scare was on, and it was a scare, whether rightfully or wrongfully it does not matter. Brig. Gen. Funston had charge of the island as commanding officer. He was very kind to me. He discussed with me in detail the predicament he was in. He was not looking for Japanese troops or the troops of any other nation to land in front of the big guns, in front of the batteries of mortars, twelve 14-inch guns that protected Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, but he was looking for forces that might land anywhere all around the island. He did not want greater guns to keep off the fleet, but land defenses to protect the seacoast fortifications in the rear. Those big guns could beat back the mighty ships of any nation, but the soldiers of any nation could land all around the island, take the batteries from the rear, and then do with the cities as they pleased.

The gentleman's committee recognized that finally, because in the bill of a year ago they carried an appropriation, I think, of nearly \$600,000 to complete these very fortifications which that situation had disclosed as being so vitally essential. That gap has been closed, but it is not the only gap. We have them everywhere. We have them in the Philippines and we have them everywhere in continental United States.

The trouble is with the coast fortifications today—and the gentleman's committee is not to blame for it; the trouble is that they can stand off a fleet; they can protect a city from a fleet sailing up and bombarding it; but they can not protect the city from the landing forces, and every military officer in the coast-fortification service knows that. They have admitted frankly that a reasonably small number of troops can land here and there, almost anywhere, put the fort out of business, and then the ships can march gallantly up and bombard the city; and the city of New York stands in that position to-day. So does every other city of the land. Every gun points to the sea—not a gun points to the land—and our guns are not of the all-around fire type. New York feels snug and safe behind Fort Hancock. But any nation, provided it can dispose of our fleet, can then land troops on the Jersey coast, take Hancock in reverse, and march on to New York, with their ships booming along. A fort of the type we have serves to-day only to make certain that an enemy will not land at that particular spot and that our fleet can use that harbor as a rendezvous.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says that he feels that the coast defenses are adequate to protect all cities from bombardment, and that that is a different function from protecting from land forces elsewhere. Is the gentleman aware that there was a discussion of that matter which does not appear in the hearings?

Mr. MILLER. I am not.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the gentleman sure that the defenses of Boston, New York, and San Francisco are sufficient to protect the cities as they have grown?

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure of that. I merely assumed that for purposes of discussion. One thing more. I hope the gentleman from San Francisco is here. I saw him here a moment ago. Talking with Gen. Funston about the protection from land attack, he said that he had charge of San Francisco and its fortifications when the great fleet came around on its journey about the world.

This great fleet, the mightiest ever assembled beneath the American flag, was then commanded by one of our heroes of the practical, fighting type. He had served in two wars and in every water of the globe. When his fleet reached San Francisco, in conversation with me, Gen. Funston said:

I showed him the fortifications defending the harbor of San Francisco, and I said, "Admiral, are they not splendid?" He replied, "Fine; they can beat off the mightiest fleet of any nation in the world; but I can land 10,000 men down here near Monterey and I can capture your city within 24 hours"; and I said, "I know you can."

The solution of that, it seems to me, as has been properly expressed by many military men, is that we need a larger personnel in our coast defenses, and that is the emphatic thing stated by Gen. Weaver in the hearings. While we are pretty long on guns at the present we are miserably, contemptibly short of men, and you can not man fortifications anywhere without men. We never will have a real system of coast de-

fense until we have sufficient men to protect the forts, in some degree at least, from land attack. I have but a moment or two left, and I want to speak of the fortifications in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to yield, but I fear I have not the time. How much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I will try to complete what I have to say and then I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman if I have any time. I want to say a word about the fortifications in the Philippine Islands, all of which I visited and all of which I studied as well as a layman can study such problems. They are certainly a magnificent series of forts. We have spent upward of twelve or thirteen millions of dollars in their construction. The city of Manila lies 30 miles in at the end of the bay, and a series of islands close the mouth to the bay, Corregidor, Caballo, El Fraile, and Carabao. Corregidor is a great fortress. It is 565 feet high, with several magnificent batteries. I recall distinctly when I was at the highest battery I looked over across the water to Meriveles and I said to the man who had constructed the fortifications, "What is to prevent an enemy from landing and placing cannon on that hill yonder and commanding your forts?" He said, "Nothing on earth, and for two years I have reported showing the weakness of this position, urging that something be done to protect us against a land attack." Afterwards I met a distinguished military man and I put that to him and he laughed at it and said, "Why, that hill is so high and it is so difficult to mount guns that you could not get a gun up there that would command Corregidor." So they worked out a war problem there about a year ago. I hope I am not telling any military secrets that ought to be kept dark, but I am going to speak out in meeting. I know what happened. They settled the controversy. An expedition went out. The fort was given an aeroplane, and a mine planter, amply equipped with mines, was made ready. War was declared at a certain hour. The mine planter went to lay the mines. The expedition had gone out to sea. No man knew when it would come back or where it would land.

The mine-planting machine had not one-third of its mines laid before it was physically put out of business. How? By a gun fired from the region of that same hill. They trained the Corregidor guns upon it, but they could not locate the gun, and they never did locate it, but one day was hardly over before every gun in the commanding battery of Corregidor was theoretically silenced. Gentlemen who testified before this subcommittee and others for three years have said that could not be done. The man building the fort said it could be done, and it was done at the first test.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CALDER. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. So much for Corregidor. I would like to say a word about the others. I can say only a word about Carabao. Upon Carabao is mounted 14-inch guns, with a battery for 12-inch rifled mortars in the center. That island is located up close to the shore. You can stand on the shore and you can look right down in, as you can look down into a hopper, and see your four mortars, and there is nothing on earth to prevent men armed with nothing more than rifles—for the distance is about a thousand yards—landing on the coast yonder and shooting off every gunner you put in the place. That has been reported against constantly and turned down by the board. Furthermore, a series of ridges starting from the shore lead back with constantly increasing height, permitting reverse fire from the opposite side. There is nothing on earth to prevent an enemy from landing a few miles up the coast and coming down those ravines, you do not know which one, and by reverse fire putting out of operation those entire fortifications. That has been reported against vehemently, patriotically, earnestly. What we need in the Philippine Islands is what you finally did in Hawaii—some land protection for your seacoast fortifications.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. When the gentleman says those things have been reported against, just what does he mean?

Mr. MILLER. I mean that the men in charge of construction at Corregidor Island have sent in reports stating those conditions and recommending certain changes to remedy the defects, and their recommendations have not received favorable attention.

Mr. GARDNER. To whom have those reports gone?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER. To somebody in the War Department?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. And they have received no attention?

Mr. MILLER. They have not been acted upon.

Mr. GARDNER. That is your understanding?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not mean to give the opinion that they have not been acted upon. The gentleman means to say that they have not been agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I think it is fair to say this, that I was informed on high authority that the recommendations had been considered by the board, whatever that is, and that they had been turned down. One word further relative to Corregidor. That is supposed to represent our highest attainment in fort building beneath the American flag. As I say, the highest battery on Corregidor Island, and they are all nearly of the same height, is about 565 feet. The hill which I mentioned a while ago, as I recollect, is 973 feet high.

The distance from Corregidor to this hill is 7 miles, easy rifle shot, and I think it fair to say that the board, in turning down the recommendation of these men in actual operative construction of the fortifications, turned it down because they did not think it possible to get a gun upon that hill of a caliber sufficient to carry 7 miles. They now, by reason of the experience of the recent war, know that that easily can be done. So I assume—and, I think, I correctly assume—they would change their attitude now upon that question. Back of this 973-foot hill, however, is another one, about 10 miles distant from Corregidor, that is over 1,400 feet high. In the region of these hills for many miles each way are mountains, valleys, and gulches, all heavily wooded. It is a simple engineering feat to perfect and complete these fortifications. There must be protection on each wing. Our center is strong, but our wings are open. There must be—and any military man who examines it now will admit—fortifications at the Meriveles end protecting there, and fortifications beyond Carabao, at the other end, to protect at that point. You then have a chain of forts and fortifications that will be amply sufficient. Until you have that protection you have not anything more than a chain where two links are lamentably weak. Now, I apprehend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will say that it is expected to change this condition with respect to Corregidor, a change the Army Board has been convinced is necessary to make by reason of the maneuvers I have mentioned, as they are going to send over four mortars—12-inch mortars—and mount them at Caballo, an island lying just beyond Corregidor which already contains some very heavy guns. These guns are not to control the sea, but to control the region in Meriveles. Well, now, the distance from Caballo to the hill I have mentioned is 7 miles. There is not a mortar they are going to send of the four that can fire accurately that distance. There are mortars in the Army that can do it, but they are not the ones that are being sent over. And even if that were true, a group of mortars would be a miserably small protection against the whole region of mountains and valleys and gulches that extend from the hills I have mentioned miles and miles both east and west. The protection must be on the land, the protection which was finally vouchsafed to Hawaii. You finally had to provide them on the land there, and if you listen to wisdom you will provide them in the Philippines.

One word more relative to Corregidor defenses. For some reason I never could find out our military authorities here sent to equip Corregidor some 20 howitzers and some 20 old siege guns. These are all the short, fat-bellied type that were considered some gun in the days of our grandfathers, but which for a generation have been valuable only to decorate county courthouses and parade grounds. We laughed at the archaic, antiquated, ineffectual guns we found the Spaniards had placed on Corregidor, and yet we have gone them one step further in lunacy by placing these popguns in the forts. The fire of these guns is so slow, so mournfully slow, that one modern gun is equal to about 10 of them in point of number of shots and immeasurably superior in point of efficiency. The worst of it is that these guns have to be manned. A single modern gun crew can fire as many shots as a dozen crews working at these ancient guns. The cost of maintaining these gun crews for a single year is more, much more, than the cost of a new battery of modern guns. Verily, America, where is your boasted genius?

Gentlemen, that is all I desire to say. [Applause.] I yield back to the gentleman any time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and 52 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk about the fortifications bill this afternoon. I am heartily in sympathy with the building up of our fortifications, as, according to my notion, that is the best way to defend our country, and I am always for the establishment of a defense. I happen to serve on the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and have served for some time, and in my service there I have learned something about our Military Establishment. I do not believe that it is in the bad condition that it is pictured here by many of our friends. On the other hand, I am not one of those who are silly enough to believe that it needs no improvement. My idea is that it should be safely and sanely built up on practical American lines, on lines of general defense. While I am not going to talk about that general subject this afternoon, I am going to talk about a kindred subject. About 18 months ago I introduced a bill in this House to remedy a very important defect in our system of national defense. In the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War, in the Civil War, and in the Spanish War our great trouble as a Nation was in the lack of officers. We had to train our officers for the most part in all of those wars. Those officers were frequently made of men with no previous military training. They were trained at an immense cost of money and life, because we all recognize that it takes time to train an officer in the Army.

Gen. Washington, in one of his addresses—and I refer to it particularly to-day because of the day it is—urged Congress to prepare a better system of training officers, and West Point was created at that time, when our country was a small country of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 people, at his suggestion. Remember, now, that West Point trained practically as many officers as it does now at a time when there were only four or five millions of people in this country. Since that time we have done very little toward the training of officers. Several officers' schools and much money has been contributed without much effect upon the military training. There were the land-grant colleges, where there was really no actual military training. In 1861-62 the cry was the dearth of officers. So important was the defect in our system that it was Mr. Morrill who introduced the land-grant-college act and passed it. There was to be a way to educate officers for the Army. It did not have the effect that was expected of it. It was too late for that war. For a short time after that war the subject was talked about a good deal in the newspapers, but nothing was done, and when the Spanish War came on exactly the same result followed—that we were short of officers. It was talked about, but nothing was done. About 18 months ago I introduced a bill which provided as follows: That there should be established in each one of the 48 States a military training academy after the fashion of West Point, to be under the general auspices of the State and the Nation.

After examining into many military schools and finding out the cost of keeping a student there, it was believed that the sum of \$400 to each student would be enough to keep him and maintain him at that college during the scholastic year, house him, clothe him, feed him, educate him, and train him for that service, the Government to bear two-thirds of it and the State to bear the rest. The State legislature was to select under the terms of the bill the college or institution that was to receive the benefits of the act. These students were to be selected by counties. The county superintendent of education was to hold the examination just exactly as we Congressmen now hold examinations for selection of students for West Point. And when they were selected and accepted by the institutions, why, they were to be educated and trained, the United States Government furnishing the officers which were to do the military training and the local institutions that had been selected by the State to receive the benefit of the act to furnish the educational training, the college training, as it were, all without cost to the boy, except this, that the boy was to agree in writing that he would serve the Government at any time that he was called upon within a period of seven years after his graduation. In that length of time there would be built up a reserve of young Army officers of about 33,000, and, of course, the matter being a continuing one, why, as the seven years would expire on one set it would come in on the other, and we would have a continuing reserve of about 33,000 of these young officers.

Our military experts state that in the event of trouble about 30,000 officers would be necessary. Now, that is the substance of my bill. It was referred to the War Department, and that

department returned on the bill that it was a good one, but the then present War Department had their plans and it would not make any recommendation about it at all. After the war broke out last summer I was sent for by the department and was told that, with certain inconsequential modifications, if the bill were sent back the War Department would recommend it, as it was realized it was just exactly what was wanted under our system. It was sent back. The small changes were made. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House has considered it a number of days, given it the most careful consideration, amended it, reported it to this House, and it is now on the calendar. And it is to that bill I wish to speak.

Now, I am not one of those who believe we are likely to get into war at any time. I am not one of those who are easily thrown off their feet by fear or fright or anything of that kind. But if you gentlemen will consider the terms of this bill you will see that it does two great things. It provides for a reserve corps of officers, which is absolutely necessary in the event of defense. It provides them at a very small cost. It provides them without any interference with our established institutions, either State or National. The State absolutely controls these institutions, except in so far as the military training is concerned. The Federal Government furnishes two-thirds of the money for them, and furnishes the military training.

What would be the result if this bill as recommended by the committee should pass? It would mean that the United States Government and the several State governments would graduate, when they are all in operation, some 30,000 of these young men every year without cost to these young men. It fills a need that is said to exist by our military experts. At the same time it does something that the United States Government has never yet done. It contributes largely to the education of our young men. I say that under no circumstances could this bill if enacted into law be a mistake. In the first place, our military experts say that it is necessary. In the next place, the cost is inconsequential. In the next place, we give one of the best kinds of education to about 15,000 young men every year free of cost. While it is free of cost to them, it is not a gratuity at all, because they have to give something up. What is it? They have got to contract for their services in the event of trouble. Now, is not that—I want to appeal to you gentlemen, and I greatly regret there is not a larger membership here this afternoon, because I think this is a very important matter—is not that a safe and sane way to build up our national defenses? Is it not better than spending immense sums on experimenting, for I want to say to you gentlemen you do not experiment when you educate our youths.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. How many instructors does the gentleman think it would require to adequately instruct those 15,000 young men each year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I imagine there should not be less than one or no more than two of these instructors at each institution.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. I have an interest in what the gentleman is saying; but is it not the practice now in these land-grant institutions to have military discipline and drill and education, and upon the graduation of members of the college to give them a potential rank which would be recognized by the Government in event of war? And does the gentleman know how many of these men are graduated each year and given the status of potential officers, if we may use that term?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, practically very few are given the status of potential officers, to use the gentleman's expression. As a matter of fact, these land-grant colleges under the terms of the Morrill Act are very loose military institutions. They drill once or twice a week. They drill just enough to get the appropriation from the National Government. Now, that is all there is in that. By the terms of this bill I do not interfere with those colleges at all, for this reason, that since I have been in this House I have never interfered with any educational project; and as long as the Government is contributing to these land-grant colleges, I look upon it not as a military feature that we ought to uphold but as an educational feature that we ought to uphold. I believe that the Government can do no better under any circumstances than to educate the youth of our land.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not a fact that the Government does furnish to the institutions concerning which we are talking a representative from the Army to supervise the military education, especially in the larger institutions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only in certain of the institutions, because the President is limited only to 30 officers that he can

assign under the law to these colleges; and, of course, you can easily see that these are not sufficient. Now, under the terms of this bill that provision of the law which limits it to 30 is repealed and the President can assign such officers to these colleges that are to be established by the bill that I have introduced as he may see fit.

Now, I want to explain to the gentleman, if he will excuse me a moment or two—

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will tell you why these land-grant colleges do not effect the purpose. The National Government has not control of them. If they give one week's pretended effort at military instruction, they are entitled to the appropriation. The Government has no control over them at all, and for that reason our military authorities and the War Department say that they are not a practical benefit.

Now, under the system that we would have, a board composed of three men—the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and a civilian member appointed by the President—would have absolute control of this much of the institution: It would have to come up to the military requirements before they can get the \$80,000 that is allotted to it, and for that reason the academics that we seek to establish by this bill are directly interested in meeting the requirements; because, of course, whoever has the purse strings has control of that feature of the institution. The institution that has been selected can not get the appropriation unless it meets the requirements of the Government, in so far as the military training is concerned.

Now, I want to say that this bill has been carefully gone over and—

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will take pleasure in yielding to my friend.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman explain the character of the examination that gives eligibility to the appointee and then the character of the curriculum, and say to what extent it is a classical course?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will explain about that. I want to say as to the selection of these boys that they are required to be selected geographically. They are required to be selected from every county in every State in the Union. Of course there will be some States that have fewer counties than others, and there will be more boys from some States on that account than from others; but they must be selected by the local county superintendents, who will hold competitive examinations and give every boy an appointment who meets the requirements. It is not confined to those who may be powerful or rich. The poor boy has an equal chance with the rich boy, and under the terms of this bill the country boy has just as good or even a better chance than the city boy.

It ought to appeal to every Member here who believes in education and who believes in the actual defense of his country. This bill ought to appeal to them.

Now, that is the method of selection. It is purely upon a merit basis. It leaves out no part of our country. It leaves out no part of our people. It is a chance for a deserving, ambitious boy, wherever he may live, to receive a splendid college education.

Now, what was the other question the gentleman asked?

Mr. HULINGS. About the course, the students' course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, the local institution provides that, of course. I have no doubt but that in the State of Virginia the Virginia Military Institute would be the one that would probably be selected by that State to receive the benefits of the act. Of course it has its own curriculum and makes its own terms for admission, and, in my judgment, that is one of the attractive features of the scheme, that the local institution of each State prescribes the terms of admission upon which students may be admitted to the college. At the same time its control of the matter is not final or absolute in anything except education, because they have got to train these boys from a military standpoint with the utmost care upon such conditions and attainments and such instruction as the National Government prescribes, because if they do not they can not get the \$80,000 as applied to that particular State.

Now, I was much in hope that we could get this bill passed at this session of Congress, where we have had so much discussion about our coast defenses and so many differences about this experiment and that experiment. I have no doubt but that we will be prepared to meet any emergency along that line. We shall have the necessary ammunition if we ever get into trouble. But it is perfectly apparent to anyone who will think of it that we must have trained officers. Here we can get them at

small cost. Here we can get them by doing the greatest good to mankind that Congress ever did to the youth of our land. So far as I am concerned, I would a thousand times rather appropriate money to so educate the youth of our land so as to equip them to make good soldiers of themselves and avoid unnecessary suffering than to give pensions indiscriminately to those who sometimes suffer in war for the want of such training. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the fortification and the battleship, in proportion to their cost and relative importance in defense and offense, seem to have made a poor figure in the present European war. The fortification is said to collapse, even evaporate, at the touch of a shell from a 42-centimeter gun, and the battleship is reputed to seek a place of safety or to sink from a thrust from under the sea.

In the din of the great amount of talk indulged in here about armies and armaments and the glory of war, the infinite superiority of the instruments and the products of the arts of peace are lost to sight and sense. We all know that war is a disgrace except in self-defense, and then it impeaches the moral status and the sanity of the nation that imposes the necessity for such defense.

We hardly comprehend the gravity of our relation to the war that is now going on. Rome after Cannæ had no worse outlook, and Carthage after Zama had no more fateful prospect than is now held out in the horoscope of civilization. The daily disasters in Europe are only digging deeper the pit in which to bury the happiness of the human race. And yet the sulphurous fumes and the ghastly sights of the battle field seem to exhilarate instead of disgusting men. Physical courage is a good thing, but it is nothing to brag about, for it is common even among the four-footed beasts. Men pretend that we need to have war in order to prove that we are brave. Americans have shown on a thousand fields of carnage that they have courage of the first quality, and they have shown it so well that the world will never forget it. There are nobler fields of action and higher ambitions than to make and conduct human slaughterhouses.

If the worse than wasted wealth that has been thrown away on war had been applied to education in industry, in utilities, in science, and in art, there would not to-day be a single unhappy human being on earth. A statesmanship that can get for the people whose destinies it directs and controls only the arbitrament of the sword and the cannon and the torch is a reflection and a slam on the science of politics and government among men in this age. Here on this floor a fortnight ago a learned, captivating, and martial gentleman, radiating sentiments of Tyrian hue, said luridly and alliteratively that he would a thousand times rather scream with the eagle than pipe with the piping pigeon of peace, or words equally terrifying on the one hand and contemptuous on the other.

Force, reason, and moral susceptibility we all concede are the chief springs and agencies of government. The first, force, is the surest and best where no regard is paid to human rights. The second, reason, is hampered where intelligence is rare and ignorance is general. The third, moral susceptibility, is enfeebled by indifference and paralyzed when the eagle screams.

In the light of these last six months in Europe, civilization does not present an interesting or alluring prospect. The action of the times has the color and the odor and the earmarks of the age of Nero, the Roman Emperor, or of the days of Alaric, King of the Visigoths. How shall we show our appreciation of our situation in regard to this? We talk endlessly and excitedly about war, and about the value of it and the duty of it, but are we equal to what we ought to do now? There are few, if any, of us here in whose veins does not flow the blood of one or another of the nations now involved in the most stupendous conflict that ever reddened and blackened the face of the earth. At such a time it were unworthy to speak of anything other than the hopes and the fears of our stupefied, mystified, horrified race. Well-ordered government obtained in those great States and prevailed so long, the serenest confidence pervaded the civilized world that peace and progress attended them, that the rights and security of their peoples were firmly established, and that they, with us, would lead mankind to the realization of its highest destiny.

There has been a rude awakening from this complacent dream, for Europe is aflame with war and civilization itself is in jeopardy of obliteration. We have learned that to be prepared for war does not insure peace, but rather induces the pre-

cupitation of strife. We seek to know the cause of this fury and persistent rage and devastation. Does it show that our civilization is a mere veneer? Is it a case of reversion to type, as of the well-trained canine to the vulpine pack? Is there a reasonable, tangible, appreciable cause for this shedding of seas of blood and covering a continent with gloom and horror? Men wish to know. Men believe it is the acme of the prejudice, the ambition, and the opportunism which have darkened the world with war from the beginning of time—war that paralyzes progress, that submerges civilization, that yields only death and desolation. The old Roman told it all when he said, "Inter arma silent leges"—in the midst of arms the laws are silent. Not only are the civil laws but all laws are suspended, save those devoted to the concentrated and convulsive energy of destruction. War—the opportunity of the plunderer, of the violator, of the spoiler; the keenest curse and blackest blight that can come to the man who works, for he must pay the cost. He must do the suffering and the dying. It is his family that is dissolved in tears and sunk into poverty and despair. [Applause.] War! You talk of war, that has loaded civilization with fifty thousand million dollars of debt, upon which it is now paying the interest. And yet every Christian nation is in a frenzy of haste to make more arms of precision, engines of destruction, charnel-house battleships, so as to be exquisitely prepared, instantaneously ready, at the turn of the word or the drop of the hat, to maim, mangle, destroy, and desolate their fellow Christians. [Applause.] All are spurred on by the same madness; no nation can hesitate, or it will be trampled; all must keep the quickstep of the gory procession. Ah, what a civilization. It challenges barbarism for folly, fury, and monstrosity. It is a felonious beggar on horseback, crimson with the blood of innocents, livid with the leprosy of injustice—the price of the pride, the arrogance, the hypocrisy, and the mendacity of the age we have the hardihood to boast. [Applause.]

It is not strange that mankind shudders, stumbles, hesitates, recoils, and retreats since it is the policy of the great States to have their strong young men slain or crippled in battle. War feeds on the stalwart, the high spirited, the best, and discards the ruck of the race that can bestow nothing upon posterity but an enfeebled progeny to eke out wretched, paralytic, and hopeless lives. Who will answer for this immolation, who atone for the wreck of nations? What is the philosophy and where is the statesmanship of it? There is none. It is a colossal fraud and a hideous crime. [Applause.] The Modoc, the Malay, and the maniac could do no worse in government than civilization is doing to-day.

Have intelligence and moral sensibility stood still, made no advance since the dire days of Attila? Is the lust for material dominion and despotic control of aliens a sign, a token, an evidence of culture, of mental elevation and equilibrium and of psychic perfection?

Does man differ from the beast of the jungle only in the stronger desire and better facility to inflict pain, perpetrate ruin, and magnify and multiply woe? Must all energy, industry and invention be devoted to armies for defense or to slaughter for conquest? To what baleful, doleful pass has our vaunted progress brought us, and what have our freedom, our schools, and our churches done for us if we must forever burden the people with the necessity to prepare to destroy and to desolate their fellow men? Is it true that "judgment hath fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason"? Can not we believe that this unprecedented, this unholy, this world war will result in universal and permanent peace, through exhaustion and the aversion its hecatombs of victims will beget against the massacre of nations? [Applause.]

Can we not hear above the clangor of battle, above the roar of the conflagration of cities, the moans of the aged, the shrieks of violated women, and the screams of orphaned children the voice of reason resounding from the confines of the great Republic?

Will it not inspire a new song that all the world will sing, in which the refrain of the chorus will ring, "Away with class and privilege and war and slaughter. Hail to peace and faith among the nations and the dawn of the reign of common sense." [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday and again to-day some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have renewed the talk of prosperity. I am not criticizing them for it. In fact, they command my admiration. When I remember that in 1914 there were more business failures than in any other year in the history of the country; that business is further below normal than ever before; that

there are more closed mills and factories to-day than ever before; that the difference between the receipts and expenditures are larger to-day than ever before; and that there are more bread lines and soup houses in this country than ever before, we can not but admire our friends when they talk about prosperity.

My distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] had some remarks to make this morning about prosperity, and I wondered whether his mail is anything like mine. I want to read a few extracts from some things that came to me to-day through the mail. First, I refer to what appeared on the first page of the Washington Post yesterday morning, which reads as follows:

PLAN HUGE WAGE CUT—52 RAILROADS IN THE EAST UNITE FOR THE CAMPAIGN—750,000 MEN ARE AFFECTED—REPLY TO ENGINEER BROTHERHOOD'S THREAT TO DEMAND INCREASE.

NEW YORK, February 20, 1915.

The railroads of the eastern territory have entered a campaign for a reduction this spring in the pay of employees from engineers down to trackmen.

This will affect the earnings of about 750,000 men and a pay roll approximating \$600,000,000 per annum.

Fifty-two railroads are identified with the movement, and the territory covered by these lines lies east of Chicago, and, roughly, is that for which an increase in freight rates has recently been granted.

Next I desire to read extracts from the Daily Iron Trade, a journal published in Cleveland, Ohio, from the edition of Friday, February 19, 1915:

MUCH SURPRISED AT VOTE'S RESULT—MILL OWNERS AND UNION OFFICERS WERE CHAGRINED—SHEET MILL CONCERNS BY REPRESENTATIVES ARE TALKING OVER SITUATION AT PITTSBURGH.

PITTSBURGH, February 19.

Middle western sheet and tin-plate manufacturers are holding a meeting here to-day in the endeavor to solve a complicated situation made so by the unexpected total rejection of the proposed reduced wage schedules by their employees. The proposed rate sanctioned by the officers of the Amalgamated Association, with which these employees are affiliated, provided an 11.2 per cent reduction for sheet-mill men and 6 per cent cut for tin-mill men, based upon sliding scales.

Then, in the same issue of the paper, I read the following:

RECEIVER NAMED—LA FOLLETTE IRON CO. TURNED OVER TO NEIL ROBINSON, OF CHARLESTON.

CINCINNATI, February 19.

A receiver has been named for the La Follette Iron Co., La Follette, Tenn., in the person of Neil Robinson, a coal operator of Charleston, W. Va., who has been receiver of the La Follette Coal, Iron & Railway Co. for about one year.

Next I read an extract from the Washington Star of February 20, 1915, which is as follows:

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MEN LOSE JOBS—STEEL MILLS AT GRANITE CITY, ILL., CLOSE FOR INDEFINITE PERIOD.

GRANITE CITY, ILL., February 20.

The steel mills here will close to-day for an indefinite period. The order closing the plants will throw more than 2,500 men out of work.

Several days ago a majority of the members of the Amalgamated Association of Steel, Iron and Tin Workers in Granite City voted to accept a cut in wages rather than have the plants closed down. The reduction, however, was not approved by the national organization and the men were ordered to demand their regular wage. This the general manager of the company announced he was not able to pay and issued the closing order.

Then, in order that I may get to all sections of the country, I have here an article from one of the newspapers of the South. I read now a clipping taken from the Gulfport Daily Herald, and I believe that Gulfport is the home of my distinguished friend from Mississippi, Mr. HARRISON: This is an interview with one Hugh McManus, and my correspondent says that he was for many years sheriff of that county. He has just recently visited Birmingham, and here is a report he made when he got home. I suppose it is safe to presume that he is a Democrat, if he has been elected sheriff down there for several terms. The article is as follows:

M'MANUS RETURNS FROM BIRMINGHAM.

After spending three days in Birmingham, Hugh McManus returned home yesterday afternoon. During his meanderings around the city Mr. McManus says he saw vast gatherings of people, and inquiring the reason for such assemblages he was told that they were meeting the train of soup wagons on their rounds, which has been sent out for the benefit of the destitute by the city authorities. It is hard to exaggerate the conditions of the working class in the mineral district of Alabama, declared Mr. McManus, and there are many young men formerly filling clerical positions in the larger stores there who are now cutting wood or performing other menial labor for 75 cents a day.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it is only a state of mind that exists in Birmingham to-day. Next I will go over to the Pacific coast, and in order to give some of my Democratic friends an opportunity to get off that very witty saying about my having the shingles, I am not going to refer to shingles, but I am going to read from a letter which I hold in my hand, from one of the leading lumbermen of the Pacific coast. He calls my attention to a letter which he incloses and from which I will read a sentence or two:

Canadian import tariff effective to-day imposes a duty of 7½ per cent at mill value of lumber, rough and dressed, cross-ties, switch ties, and other articles. This is an addition to the tariff previously in effect on dressed lumber.

That shows how Canada is taking care of her lumbermen. In commenting upon that my correspondent says:

The attached copy of letter from the general purchasing agent of the Grand Trunk Railway system, with headquarters at Montreal, Quebec, was received in our office this morning, and is self-explanatory.

There never has been any duty on rough lumber from the States into Canada. Heretofore we have enjoyed a fairly lucrative trade with the railways, shipping, of course, rough lumber only, such as ties and timbers. Since the tariff into this country has been removed a great deal of lumber has been shipped from British Columbia into the States, and now, since the Canadian Government sees fit to put a duty on lumber, so as to prevent any possibility of our shipping into their territory, it certainly is doing just what the lumber manufacturer needs in British Columbia. Sad to relate, our Government seems blind to the necessity of the lumbermen of the coast and elsewhere. As you know, it is absolutely impossible now to charter vessels for any cargo trade. This situation, together with the railways being unable to buy any material, has demoralized the lumber industry on the coast beyond description.

Unless the European difficulties are settled within a very short time, the lumber industry here will be bankrupt. We certainly have been unjustly dealt with on the tariff question by the present Congress. I must say this, in spite of the fact that I cast my first presidential vote for Grover Cleveland and my last one for Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The correspondent of the gentleman must have made a mistake when he said it was impossible to charter vessels. Evidently the gentleman did not read that portion into the Record as a part of his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly I did; and the reason you can not get cargoes—

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was saying that there were more vessels than business.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman, in the language of the street, to "butt in" in the middle of a sentence. I am willing to yield to him at any time in an orderly way.

The reason why you can not get cargoes is that, notwithstanding your party platform—and I was in hopes that you would not say anything about that, so that I would not have to refer to your party platform again, for I have some consideration for your feelings and I do not like to refer to it—the reason is that you forgot your party platform promises about the Panama Canal and have imposed \$1.50 a thousand upon every thousand feet of lumber that goes through the Panama Canal to the Atlantic coast from the Pacific. That is the reason why we can not get vessels, and that is what he had in his mind. There would have been American vessels sufficient for this trade if the canal had been left free for them.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No. If the gentleman will ask me properly, I will yield; but hereafter, if he does not, I shall decline to yield. Although this gentleman is a Democrat, he knows what he is talking about, and I wish I could say that much always about my friend from Missouri when he is talking on the tariff question. I have other articles here—so many that I hardly have the hardihood to read them all—but this one I will read:

WATCH BUSINESS HARD HIT—THE SETH THOMAS CLOCK CO. TO CLOSE GREATER PART OF ITS THOMASTON PLANT.

The Seth Thomas Clock Co., employing 400 hands has closed the greater part of its plant here because, as it states in a posted notice: "Trade conditions in the watch business have been very bad and are steadily growing worse. There is practically no demand for watches," continues the notice, "and we are no longer able to continue the manufacture of watches which we can not sell. We are very sorry to close the greater part of our watch shop until the market conditions improve." To the employees the announcement does not come wholly unexpected, as a large number have been laid off during the past six months and those who have been retained have been working only about 40 hours a week.

Then, turning to another one headed "Tariff to blame," it says:

TARIFF TO BLAME.

The placing of 3,000 employees of the Waltham Watch Co. on short time has resulted from the business depression in the United States induced by the tariff changes, and not because of the interference with the company's foreign business because of the European war, according to Vice President Conover Fitch, of the company. Mr. Fitch is quoted as saying:

"We have been obliged to reduce the number of working hours in our establishment because of the extreme depression in this country. That the depression here in our business is due partly to the effects of the European war is undoubtedly true, but in my opinion it is mainly due to the change in tariff and policies of government and consequent general depression, which was being felt seriously before the outbreak of the European war. It is a fact that Swiss manufacturers are taking advantage of the reduced tariff duties and loss of European markets to flood this country with their products regardless of price."

Then I have one, "Business conditions—Dividend one-third of those in 1913." This gives a long list of the different steel companies and their earnings, as compared with last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting

some 25 or 30 more illuminating illustrations of the business prosperity we now enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BUSINESS CONDITIONS—DIVIDENDS ONE-THIRD THOSE OF 1913.

Net earnings of the Republic Iron & Steel Co., applicable on the \$25,000,000 preferred shares, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1914, were \$1,028,748, equivalent to 4.12 per cent, as compared with \$3,101,300, or 12.4 per cent, last year. The Republic Co. has experienced its full share of the depression ruling in the iron and steel trade. Chairman John A. Topping, in his remarks to stockholders, states the year was decidedly the worst in the history of the company as to prices and demand, although earnings were considerably above previous periods of depression, due to lower costs as a result of improved facilities and other economic influences. Wages of employees, however, were not reduced. Commenting upon the unsatisfactory condition of the iron and steel business last July, Chairman Topping said: "The earnings of the company for the six months' period ended June 30, 1914, emphasize the general effect on business resulting from tariff reductions and trade hesitation incident to the enactment of new laws and the discussion of radical legislation."

FEBRUARY DIVIDEND PAYMENTS.

According to the Journal of Commerce, the dividend payments for February this year will be \$8,164,392 less than those of February, 1914. The decrease in industrial companies will be over \$6,000,000. A summary of the February dividends, with comparisons for the same month a year ago, follows:

	1915	1914	Shrinkage.
			Per cent.
Industrials.....	\$25,111,873	\$31,778,216	26
Steam railroads.....	19,938,336	21,323,236	7
Street railways.....	3,814,363	3,927,512	3
Total.....	48,864,572	57,028,964	17

SEVERE BUSINESS DEPRESSION.

The severity of the business depression of 1914 is emphasized by the annual reports of the great steel manufacturing plants of the country of their operations during the past year. The United States Steel Corporation reported for the last quarter of the year the smallest earnings of its career and was forced to pass the dividend on its common stock.

The showings made by some of these companies last year are the unanswerable argument against the present low-tariff system. They represent the harvest reaped from the enactment of the many antibusiness laws and the discussion of radical legislation. Net results of several companies, as set forth by the Daily Iron Trade last week, were as follows:

The Cambria Steel Co. earned 4.36 per cent on its outstanding capital in 1914, which was only 31 per cent on its 1913 earnings of 13.8 per cent on its capital. Its November and February dividends were declared payable in scrip.

The Republic Iron & Steel Co. earned 4.12 per cent on its preferred stock, as compared with 12.4 per cent the previous year. It passed its September and December dividends.

The American Iron & Steel Manufacturing Co., Lebanon, Pa., withdrew \$206,321 from its undivided profits during the year, according to its balance sheet, which is the only statement it gives out to the public.

The J. G. Brill Co., Philadelphia, car manufacturer, earned 3.47 per cent on its preferred stock, which compares with 19.63 per cent in 1913. Dividends were reduced in November and February from 12 per cent to 1 per cent.

The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. was the one brilliant exception. In its report for the past six months its earnings were at the rate of 7 per cent on preferred and 8 per cent on common.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. also made a better record than the average for the year.

A summing up of current conditions shows a great deal of ground has been gained in the past two months. The Steel Corporation's works are operating on an average of about 60 per cent of capacity; independent plant activities range between 45 and 55 per cent. In the first part of December, when the lowest level was touched from the standpoint of operations, prices, and orders, the steel works' operating average dropped to about 25 to 30 per cent.

ACCEPT WAGE CUT.

Reading Iron Co. puddlers, helpers, and muck-mill hands, by vote of February 6, have decided to continue working at the announced wage reduction of 50 cents a ton for puddling, effective next Monday. The company proposes, as soon as market conditions warrant, puddlers' wages will return to the \$5-a-ton basis. It is stated other employees of the company will accept a proposed wage reduction.

ANOTHER WAGE REDUCTION.

Sheet and tin-plate workmen employed in a dozen independent mills in the Middle West and affiliated with the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, agreed on February 5 to accept a wage reduction from 6 to 11.2 per cent. This agreement affects mills in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri. While some of these independent mills have been working at 40 per cent of capacity, it is understood they will add to their working forces immediately.

RAILROAD DEFAULTS IN 1914.

Stocks and bonds of American railroads in receivership were increased by approximately \$200,000,000 in 1914, and the total is now, in the aggregate, more than \$1,200,000,000. Total trackage now in default in this country amounts to 16,104 miles. Last year 22 railroads went into receivers' hands, according to a compilation of Dow, Jones & Co. Their funded debt amounted to \$137,250,300 and their outstanding capital stock totaled \$62,321,000, a grand total of \$199,571,300.

FAILURES IN JANUARY.

The statistics of commercial failures in the United States for January disclose a business mortality far in excess of normal. "The largest

number of failures ever recorded in any month and the seventh largest aggregate of monthly liabilities are evidences that liquidation of crippled commercial concerns went forward apace in January. Total insolvencies for January, as reported to R. G. Dun & Co., reached the unprecedented number of 2,848, and several defaults of unusual size swelled the aggregate indebtedness to \$49,640,575, these figures comparing with 1,857 suspensions for \$39,374,347 in the same period of the preceding year, 1,814 for \$22,972,769 in 1913, 1,814 in 1912 for only \$19,770,530, and but 1,663 four years ago, when the liabilities were \$24,090,649.

MORE MEN ACCEPT WAGE CUT.

The plants of the National Enameling & Stamping Co., in Granite City, Ill., and St. Louis, will begin operations next Monday with a full force working full time as the result of a referendum vote of the ironworkers accepting a cut in wages. The vote, taken Saturday, was announced to-day. More than 3,000 workmen will get jobs under the reduced scale.

The wage scale was to be on a sliding basis, varying with the market price of the factories' products. The cut was necessary, the officers said to-day, owing to the inability of the independent factories to compete with the trust companies under the old scale.

The Bank of North America, one of the leading Philadelphia banks, in its February trade letter says: "During the last half of 1914 the shoe manufacturing business of the country was not better than 60 per cent of normal. The leather business, aided even by the foreign demand, was in scarcely more active state."

Nathan T. Folwell, the president of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, in an interview published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger, February 5, said: "Had there been no European war either there would have been a decided reduction in wages or the mills of my firm, as well as those of other manufacturers similarly situated, would undoubtedly have been forced to shut down as a direct consequence of the tariff reduction put into force by the present Washington administration."

The First National Bank, of Boston, in its New England letter of January 15, 1915, said: "During the past 30 years business sentiment in New England has undergone a change. The optimism which sprang up soon after the outbreak of the war, when it was recognized that the United States had escaped financial disaster, has given way to a less buoyant feeling. Disappointing trade returns furnish ample evidence that in New England general business has gone back in the last few weeks, and the indications are that but little improvement can be expected in the immediate future. The prevailing feeling is that after a few months we can hope for a small and gradual increase in activity, but early relief from the present severe business depression in the shape of anything like normal business is not expected."

Railways operating 228,461 miles of line, or about 90 per cent of all steam railway mileage in the United States, reports operating revenues for the month of November, 1914, amounting to \$238,812,430. This amount includes revenues from freight and passenger traffic, from carrying mail and express, and from miscellaneous sources connected with rail and auxiliary operations. Compared with November, 1913, these operating revenues show a decrease of \$32,836,569. Total operating revenues per mile averaged \$1,023 in November, 1914, and \$1,180 in November, 1913, a decrease of \$157, or 13.3 per cent.

Imports to the United States under the operations of the Underwood tariff law for 10 months—to July, 1914, before the outbreak of the war—increased \$102,478,621, while in the same period duties paid on imports decreased \$30,770,070. The increased importations, amounting to over \$100,000,000, displaced more than an equal amount of American-made goods, and resulted in heavy losses in employment and wages.

The number of persons sheltered in the municipal lodging houses in New York during the mild January of the present year has been steadily over 2,000 a night, and has risen as high as 2,660. This represents an increase of approximately 50 per cent over January of last year, when the weather was very severe during a great part of the month, while the increase over 1912 is very much greater. For the month of December, 1914, the average number cared for at the lodging houses was 1,288, as compared with 479 in December, 1912.

In a city of about 35,000, near New York, a census of the number of skilled workers out of employment was taken during January, 1915. Out of 147 carpenters in the city it was found that 113, or nearly four-fifths, were out of work. Approximately the same condition prevailed among the other trades canvassed. This was not a city having any large individual establishments where the closing of a single mill might throw a large number out of work, and it may be taken therefore as typical of existing conditions.

For the seven months of the calendar year 1914 up to August 1, or preceding the European war, the imports of cloths and dress goods, as compared with the seven months of the previous year, were in value as follows:

Imports.	1914	1913
Cloth (seven months).....	\$10,879,813	\$2,852,052
Dress goods (seven months).....	5,602,943	1,899,275

In the case of cloths this was nearly fourfold and in the case of dress goods threefold the imports of the corresponding months of 1913, which were not much less than the average of the years immediately preceding. The result of the Simmons-Underwood tariff has been to give European manufacturers a greatly increased market in the United States at the expense of American manufacturers without any appreciable reduction in the cost or improvement in the quality of the clothing of the American people. Speaking of the condition of the woolen and worsted industry in New England, the First National Bank of Boston said in one of its New England letters: "Activity in the main New England industries has declined. This is especially true in woolen and worsted manufacturing, nearly one-half of its machinery being now idle, in spite of the receipt of foreign orders. There are two principal reasons for this depressed condition; one is the very great increase in the imports of the foreign goods, which are from two to four times as great as a year ago, and the other factor the large amount of unemployment throughout the country, which affects the ability of the people to buy and wear woolen clothing."

The condition of the steel industry is reflected by the passing by the United States Steel Corporation of its dividend on the common stock for the quarter ending December 31, 1914, the worst three months in the history of the corporation so far as earnings were concerned. Operations of steel plants have been reduced to as low as 40 per cent, and at present are probably not over 55 per cent capacity.

The report of G. M. Haffords & Co. on the earnings of 37 cotton-cloth corporations in Fall River showed an average of 0.903 per cent for the first quarter of 1915—the next to the lowest average on record. The same quarter in 1914 showed an average dividend of 1.23 per cent. The average total dividend for the four quarters of 1914 were 4.239 per cent as compared with 7.29 per cent in 1913 and 10.93 per cent in 1907, the year in which there were also notable stock dividends.

The First National Bank of Boston, in the New England letter of February 16, 1915, says: "While an improvement in sentiment has been developing for several months, it is only within the last few weeks that a betterment in actual trade conditions has been discernible. The advance on the whole is slight, but there have been almost no retrogressions, and distinct progress has been made in several important lines. To be sure, the record of failures for January was the worst on record, and the December losses in railroad gross earnings were startling. These losses were not confined to New England, such roads as the Pennsylvania and the New York Central falling off 13 per cent from the preceding year, six typical southern railroads 19 per cent, and five representative western railroads 12 per cent; nevertheless, in New England informal reports for the New Haven Railroad show the number of cars loaded locally since January 1 to be almost up to the figures of a year ago, while the number of cars loaded elsewhere but entering New England show a slight advance over the same month of the preceding year. Again, bank clearings for January, while they show extreme depression, reflect a somewhat greater volume of commercial and industrial activity. Although there is a tendency to exaggerate the real upward trend of the steel industry, the consensus of opinion seems to be that in the last three months the industry has increased its operating rate from a little under 40 per cent to slightly over 50 per cent of capacity; this means that steel has made a moderate recovery from a condition approaching the desperate to one of pronounced depression."

IDLE CARS.

The total surplus of idle cars as of February 1, 1915, was 227,473 cars, compared with 127,325 cars on November 1, 1914, and 211,960 cars on February 1, 1914. It is probable that had reports been received from the same number of roads in February as in November the total number of idle cars would have been increased by approximately 50,000 to a total of two hundred and seventy-seven thousand-odd. Reports as of February 1, 1915, have been received from 159 roads operating 1,854,150 cars, while figures for November 1, 1914, were furnished by 192 roads operating 2,203,414 cars.

SHOWS BIG LOSS.

The Westinghouse Machine Co. reports to the New York Stock Exchange for the nine months ended December 31, 1914, as follows:

Sales billed.....	\$3,576,399
Cost of sales billed, expenses, depreciation, etc.....	3,631,346
Operating loss.....	54,947
Other income.....	67,141
Total income.....	12,194
Interest charges.....	347,537
Net loss.....	335,342

[Editorial from Daily Iron Trade.]

"AIN'T NO SICH ANIMILE NOWHERE."

"It were a journey like the path to heaven
To help you find them."—Milton.

The road to Tipperary is short and easy compared with the path of the real, genuine, true, disinterested patriot
Who poses as a tariff reformer in Congress.

For now comes the Birmingham Age-Herald—

Published right in the home of the man who lent his name to the last misfit tariff measure—

And

It says:

"The Sixty-fourth Congress will be wise if it revises the tariff, and if it does it in such a way as to give just and proper relief, and at the same time not afford to the Republicans an opportunity to make their old-time high-tariff slogan tell in the next campaign."

Right down in "good old Alabam," U. S. A.

Where they have fought previous tariffs as if it were a war for life,
And where there now is open rebellion and positive conviction that the new tariff wrought a huge injustice to the iron, steel, and sugar industries.

They want it revised—

And done quickly—

Before those horrid Republicans get a chance to make a battle cry

And do it again.

What a real job they will have if they undertake to fix up all the inequalities of this Congress's legislation in the next Congress!

And what wonderful speeches will surely be made by the Democrats themselves!

That is

(Of course)

If they don't invoke

The Reed rules or the Cannon rules to prevent debate in this case, as they did last time.

A great number of Democrats are quite frank in pointing out serious errors in the present tariff law,

While no one really has been pleased—

All are apologetic—

All on the defensive—

No one happy

And if anyone desires to locate a loyal, disinterested defender of the Underwood tariff bill

He would have to spend the rest of his life searching in vain.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER] may also have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many speeches the other side expects to finish in.

Mr. SHERLEY. There will be but one speech on our side.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting discussion this afternoon, and I am sure that the Members of the committee who were present were much instructed by some of the speeches that have been made. We had a talk from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] on an international court of peace. I am confident that every man in this House would vote to establish a tribunal that would deal fairly with all the nations of the earth and assure universal peace. The gentleman from South Carolina apparently does not believe in preparedness for war. I am not of that class either, but differ from him in that I strongly favor being prepared against war. [Applause.] We have had a very illuminating address from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER], who discussed civilization, and I am sure when we read his speech in the RECORD to-morrow we will take it home and treasure it as one fit to have a place in our libraries.

We have had speeches on the tariff and the business conditions of the country, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] read Washington's Farewell Address, which seemed almost prophetic of this period of our country's history. We have quite generally followed the advice of Washington in our foreign affairs, and it is well for those who are charged with the responsibility of government to-day to bear in mind this masterly address in dealing with the problems of the moment. And we had two good speeches on our national defense by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. As a member of the subcommittee on fortifications of the Committee on Appropriations which prepared this measure, I have no quarrel with either of these gentlemen. I do not agree with them entirely, but I do approve of some of the facts they have stated. Their remarks were very interesting and they imparted some valuable information to the committee. I will not take up all of the subjects they talked about, for I am convinced the very able chairman of the subcommittee on fortifications, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], will make a satisfactory explanation of the bill when the time comes and dispose of any fear on the part of the committee that we have not done our full duty to the country in the report upon this measure. Nobody to-day, except the gentleman from Massachusetts, has discussed any of the items in this measure, and I am going to take the time of the committee for a few moments to explain some of them.

Our coast defenses before the Civil War were in good condition, compared with those of other important nations. The forts were constructed of masonry and were equipped with smoothbore guns. As the result of the Civil War and the war between France and Germany in 1871 many new inventions along the line of armament developed, and, with the improvement in naval vessels both in armor and armament, our fortifications were rendered vulnerable. For many years after the Civil War little was done to better these changed conditions. Boards were appointed by different Secretaries of War, and some improvements were recommended and acted upon, but it was not until the appointment of the Endicott Board in 1885 that a comprehensive investigation of our seacoast defenses was undertaken. As a result of the report of this board a general policy was formulated by the War Department and a report was made to Congress setting forth a scheme of fortifications, which was approved by Congress, and the beginning of the modernizing of the coast defenses was undertaken. The total cost of the fortifications recommended in the report was \$126,377,800, exclusive of ammunition. Large sums of money were appropriated and the work was started.

The action of the Endicott Board was modified, however, materially as the result of the findings of the National Coast Defense Board, otherwise called the Taft Board, which reported to Congress on March 6, 1906. This report estimated that the cost of completing the defenses, including \$6,571,301 for ammunition, would be \$50,879,339. Since the date of the report of the Taft Board there has been appropriated approximately \$10,432,800. Subsequently the project was further changed by the War Department. The latest modifications include a change in the armament for the entrance to Chesapeake Bay at Cape Henry, and provide for the defense of San Pedro Harbor, Cal., and somewhat of a reduction in the quality of armament prescribed for other places. The whole seacoast project to date calls for a total of 1,301 guns and mortars of caliber from 3-inch to 16-inch, inclusive, and of this number 91 per cent have been provided for and are now mounted in our fortifications. There remains to be appropriated for 117 guns and mortars. It is estimated that it will require an appropriation of \$40,000,000 to complete our seacoast defenses. The basis of the ammunition supply for continental United States is the provision of a sufficient quantity to carry through a two-hour engagement one-half the total number of guns manned in the forts. Of this amount we have on hand 73 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for one moment there?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. That is 73 per cent of the supply for the guns already provided for, is it not, and not for the whole project?

Mr. CALDER. I am under the impression, although I may be wrong, that it is 73 per cent of the entire project.

Mr. GARDNER. It is only 66 per cent of the entire project.

Mr. CALDER. Yes; the gentleman is right.

Mr. GARDNER. I have the letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. CALDER. The amount of ammunition on hand and appropriated for is 73 per cent of the amount required for the guns and mortars now in place; and that does seem a small quantity. The testimony of Gens. Crozier and Weaver before the committee agrees that this is not sufficient, and I am in accord with them. I will say frankly to this committee that if the War Department had asked for a larger appropriation for this item it would meet with my approval. But gentlemen should not be unnecessarily alarmed at the amount of ammunition for our seacoast defenses.

When one stops to consider the extent of our fortifications it can readily be understood that no condition could prevail that would entail but a very small number of our guns being engaged at the same time. No one suggests that we are going to fire all of the guns and mortars in the country on the exact moment. I am sure, however, as the result of the information obtained in the hearings this year and the agitation on the subject, that the War Department will come to Congress in the next session with a request for a substantial increase. Although I will not be a Member of the next Congress, and unable to vote for this increase, I am sure that the fortifications committee will agree that this particular item should be substantially enlarged. In our insular possessions the ammunition supply provided is double the reserve for the United States. Whether or not that is a sufficient amount is a question for the War Department itself to determine. The committee, in presenting this bill this year, has given exactly what the War Department asked for.

Our seacoast defenses generally are in good condition. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] have in their remarks dealt with the range of the large guns. I agree with them that the range of these guns is not great enough to meet the 15-inch guns on some of the newer superdreadnaughts of England and Germany, which are claimed will reach 21,000 yards. The War Department believes, however, that with the appropriation asked for and recommended by the committee the department will be able to alter the carriage and powder chambers of the 12 and 14 inch guns in both our continental and insular possessions, so that their range will be sufficiently increased to keep off the attack of any of the warships above referred to. I might add that it is the intention of the War Department, in the new fortifications and in any changes in the present fortifications, to locate batteries of 16-inch guns, with a range exceeding that of any warship afloat or contemplated.

Now, our field-artillery ammunition—

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. GARDNER. Before the gentleman gets off the subject of our coast fortifications I will say that I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Sun of February 6, in which it is reported that a discussion had arisen in the committee as to whether or not warships could lie off Rockaway Beach and bombard any part of the city of New York. Is it true that there was a general discussion in the committee, which does not appear in the hearings, as to whether or not Boston and New York and San Francisco were safe?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, in a committee like the Subcommittee on Fortifications, and I assume sometimes in the Naval and Military Committees, matters are discussed informally that very properly ought not to be disclosed to the public gaze. I often feel in reading over these hearings that we have printed much that should not be published. But it has been the policy of the committees of Congress to quite thoroughly examine witnesses from the Army and Navy and obtain all proper information. In my two years' service on the Fortifications Committee many subjects have been informally discussed by witnesses and members of the committee.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, if we lost all our Navy; if we had no howitzers to place on the beach at Rockaway; if we had no mines to plant to take care of the ships of hostile countries

in time of war; if we broke down completely in our defensive operations and the water off Rockaway Beach proves deep enough to permit a foreign fleet to come within firing range, it would be possible that the menace suggested by the newspaper article referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] might occur. In connection with the statement that the gentleman quotes I am free to say that the possibility of shelling New York City and other cities of the country was discussed. But for my part—and I think I share the opinion of the committee—we felt as the result of our investigations on this subject that the people of New York have no reason to be unnecessarily alarmed.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I call the attention of the gentleman to Gen. Weaver's evidence, on page 64, where he says:

It is true that there are certain places—very few of them—where it will probably be necessary to provide additional armaments to prevent the distant bombardment of cities.

Is New York one of those places?

Mr. CALDER. The defenses of New York City were referred to. Answering the gentleman's question further, I would say that if we lost control of the sea, if we had no guns to place on Rockaway Beach and had no mines to plant, there would be a risk.

Mr. GARDNER. I see from the newspaper article that the reason given why New York was safe was because the water off Rockaway Beach was so shallow. Now, I have in my hand a map showing the soundings off Rockaway Beach, and I find that within a mile of the beach there is perfectly good water at a depth of from 5½ to 5½ fathoms. If it is not true that that was the reason why Brooklyn could not be attacked from off Rockaway Beach, then it is not true that it was on account of the shallowness of the water.

Mr. CALDER. If the depth of water off Rockaway is sufficient to permit battleships to come as near the beach as the gentleman indicates, no doubt proper steps would be taken in time of war to protect the city.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask the gentleman if it is practicable to strew mines along the coast without having any fortifications to reach the mine fields?

Mr. CALDER. Well, I am not an Artillery officer, neither am I a technical expert on the subject of mines; but I will say to the gentleman that as to the possibility of defenses along Rockaway Beach I have not very much fear of New York City being attacked. Even if an attempt were made I doubt if they could seriously injure us.

Now, we are not at war with any great nation, and we are not likely to be, and I feel very confident that long before we could be involved the War Department, which is familiar with this subject, would take the necessary measures in the premises. I have discussed this problem with the officials of the War Department, and I know they have it under serious advisement.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, one moment more. The gentleman is very candid and very lucid. Of course, if there is not going to be any war we need not have any fortifications at all, but if it is all to be as smooth sailing as the gentleman says why was not that whole conversation reported in the hearings?

Mr. CALDER. I repeat. Very often in the Committee on Appropriations, or its subcommittee on fortifications—and I assume in other committees of like character in the House—conversations are held regarding fortifications in different parts of the country.

In preparing this bill at the last session of Congress we discussed very freely the condition of the fortifications in the Philippines and Hawaii without having it recorded in the hearings. I will say frankly to the gentleman that at my solicitation the Secretary of War has taken all of these matters under advisement with reference to the seacoast defenses of New York City, and after a thorough investigation if, in his judgment, it is believed additional fortifications are necessary he has agreed to come to the House at the next session and make such recommendations as he thinks proper. The responsibility now rests with him.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. My colleague will not deny that our great Navy, which is the second largest in the world, could amply protect the city of New York, and no other warships could come near enough to bombard that great metropolitan city without being annihilated by our Navy.

Mr. CALDER. I do not doubt it.

Mr. LEVY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss for a moment the condition of our field-artillery ammunition. In

this bill we appropriate \$1,160,000. In the Army bill we appropriated \$2,900,000 for the purchase of additional field ammunition. These two items together will increase our reserve supply from 31 per cent to 48 per cent of the whole project. When I say the whole project I mean based on a mobile army of 450,000 men, and figuring on 3½ guns to every 1,000 infantry and cavalry men. At the present rate of appropriation enough reserve ammunition to provide for this entire project will be on hand within a period of four years. It is estimated it will cost \$16,500,000 to manufacture the balance of the ammunition called for.

The appropriation in this bill for our mountain, field, and siege cannon is \$450,000. There is also an item of \$2,090,000 for field artillery in the Army bill, which makes a total of \$2,540,000 appropriated this year for our mountain, field, and siege guns. We have now on hand 1,000 machine guns and 213 batteries equalling 850 guns out of a total of 1,292 guns. It is estimated that this project is within six years of completion. In my judgment, our field artillery and field ammunition are in excellent shape. The Chief of Ordnance testified in the hearings before the committee that when we have this entire project complete, both as to artillery and ammunition, that if we were called upon to place a mobile army of 450,000 or even larger in the field we would have no difficulty in maintaining an ample supply.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion here and other places about the character of our field artillery and ammunition as compared with that of the countries engaged in the European war. We have been repeatedly asked what lesson have we learned from that war. We have read in the newspapers of the terrible havoc of the 42-centimeter guns and the other great armaments of the contending nations. Your committee questioned closely the officers who appeared before us as to what information they had obtained as to the character of the guns and ammunition possessed by the countries engaged. We were advised that the knowledge so far secured would not warrant them in making any modification of their program for the field artillery and ammunition. When the reports of the officers now abroad are made and finally considered it is possible the War Department may desire to make some change in their plans. I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have no land fortifications in this country that would require the character of guns used by the contending countries. We are at peace with our neighbor, Canada, on the north, and neither Canada nor the United States have fortifications on the border. Mexico on the south is too weak to cause any concern.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that this bill does not deal with the question of the personnel of the Coast Artillery. If it did, I would insist that it carry a provision for a substantial increase in this service. In 1907 Congress fixed the number of Coast Artillery companies at 170, with a total of 701 officers and 19,321 enlisted men. It was estimated that this number was a meager requirement for the defenses of the United States alone. There have, up to the present time, been abstracted from the coast line of the United States proper for manning over-sea fortifications the following:

	Companies.
For the Philippine Islands.....	11
For Hawaii.....	8
For the Panama Canal.....	6
Total.....	25

In the near future it will be necessary to take additional companies from the United States, making the total number taken:

	Companies.
For the Philippine Islands.....	24
For Hawaii.....	13
For Panama.....	12
Total.....	49

Leaving in the United States 121 companies. The shortage of Coast Artillery troops for the United States proper is, therefore, at the present time so far below the requirements as to make it deserving of the serious consideration of Congress. The statement I have made above is the testimony of the Chief of Coast Artillery, who also calls attention to the necessity of Congress providing for the authority to increase the enlistment of master electricians, electrician sergeants, engineers, and firemen whose services are necessary in the proper manning of our improved coast defenses. I am sure that it is very important that Congress take up at an early date the question of adding to the Coast Artillery force the men asked for by the chief of this service. We can manufacture guns and ammunition, we can build displacements, but well-trained men thoroughly equipped to handle the delicate mechanism of our guns and mortars can not be obtained at a moment's notice. This is the most impor-

tant branch of the service, and I regret that in passing the Army bill no provision was made to increase this force.

Last week our attention was called to the fact that it was 17 years since the battleship *Maine* was destroyed in Havana Harbor. When war came as a result, it was fought under conditions of unpreparedness that made our concentration camps more deadly to our soldiers than the bullets of the enemy. The system adapted to the needs of an Army of 25,000 broke down utterly as its task was suddenly and unexpectedly increased. The sufferings of our patriotic young men, eager to serve their country in her hour of need, the subsequent scandals, and the revelation of our weakness, I regret, has been forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of this legislation the committee having it in charge has voted to give to the War Department substantially every dollar asked for. If the amount is insufficient, the responsibility is theirs. They are charged with the conduct of this branch of our Government. If they had asked for more, I would have voted to give it to them. We decry expenditures for the national defense, and I agree with gentlemen that because of some useless Army camps and naval stations money is wasted. I would call the attention of the committee, however, to the statement of Chancellor Lloyd George in the British House of Commons on Monday of last week. This speech was a revelation to the world of the stupendous cost of modern war. The statement of the chancellor to the effect that the cost of the war to the allies was \$10,000,000,000 a year is startling. What would the opponents of national defense in the United States say to such an expenditure. I do not expect this country to go to war, at least not in the very near future. I believe that the struggle in Europe will leave the contending powers in such a condition that they will have no desire for further trouble. It is true that, judging from the facts surrounding the conditions abroad, our embarrassments are increasing, but I am confident that the common sense of the American people will not tend to create a sentiment that may rush the President off his feet.

I have seldom agreed with the President in his fiscal policies, and not always in his foreign policies, but I shall do what I can to assist him to mollify our people if any efforts are made by unwise men to involve us in this conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the \$10,000,000,000 expenditure of the allies. The cost of our national defense for this year is barely 2½ per cent of this amount. After all, is it not better for us to keep ourselves in a state of preparedness, to some degree, at least, if, perchance, out of a clear sky we should be involved in unforeseen conflict. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixty-seven minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is now nearly 6 o'clock. The gentleman has over an hour remaining, if he consumes it all. It seems to me that under the circumstances that would be running a little too late to-night.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that to-morrow when I address the House I hope to have some data that I have not now on my desk, I shall acquiesce in the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the fortifications appropriation bill (H. R. 21491) and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, submitted a report that the files and papers described in the report of the Secretary of Commerce, House Document 1499, Fifty-third Congress, third session, dated January 16, 1915, were not needed in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which report (No. 1434) was ordered filed.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, for the purpose of printing a bill to establish and maintain a military training school at the Indian school at Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a bill to establish and maintain a military training school at the Indian school at Carlisle. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois; and

H. R. 15557. An act for the relief of Anna Miller.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.;

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisalment;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department;

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 23, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GARNER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21009) to make Van Buren, Me., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisalment, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1431), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 21531) to require railway and other carriers of passengers for hire to establish an interstate rate which shall not exceed the combination of local rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 21532) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching station on Saginaw River in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21533) to establish the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the

State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Resolution (H. Res. 742) amending section 2 of Rule VIII of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, in the form of a resolution, to accept the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress approved by the President May 8, 1915; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of the legislature of the State of South Dakota, in the form of a resolution, to accept the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress approved by the President May 8, 1915; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULKLEY: A bill (H. R. 21534) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Duggan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 21535) for the relief of the heirs of Peter F. Archer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 21536) granting an increase of pension to John R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21537) granting a pension to Lee McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 21538) for the relief of the heirs of James Turner, late of Marshall County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island City, N. Y., and members of the American Neutrality League, urging an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Findlay, Belmont, and Van Buren, Ohio, and Portland, Oreg., protesting against legislation abridging freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., relative to case of Harry K. Thaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Papers to accompany a bill for relief of the heirs of Peter F. Archer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Peter C. Johnson and others, of Racine, Wis., also Mrs. M. A. Howell and others, of Waukesha, Wis., against House bill 2644, relative to exclusion of certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. B. Seigl, C. M. Ryan, C. R. Emery, and others, of Racine, Wis., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Petitions of Caspar Peitz, jr., A. H. A. Loeber, and several hundred other citizens of Detroit, Mich., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Woman's Missionary Society, Upper South Carolina Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church South, favoring amendment to Constitution prohibiting polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of E. L. Kattman and others, of State of Ohio, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, protesting against the Deitrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of German-Irish Alliance of Passaic County, N. J., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petition of F. L. Church and others, of Central Lake, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of the Evangelical Lutheran St. Paul's Congregation, of Hickory Grove, Nemaha County, Nebr., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of M. J. Allen, William J. Weiner, and 127 others, of Grand Rapids, Mich., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of German Veleranen Bund of Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of law prohibiting export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of American citizens of Paterson, N. J., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Protest from Chamber of Commerce of Klamath, Oreg., against change in boundaries of Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana, Cal., favoring investigation of Victor Valley (Cal.) possibilities by United States Reclamation Service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolution of Shakespeare Club, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipment of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, communications from Woman's Missionary Society, Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, Cal., and from Earl Haydock, favoring Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letters from San Antonio Fruit Exchange, Pomona, Cal.; Board of Education, Oakland, Cal.; Sunset Publishing Co., San Francisco, Cal.; Standard Brick Co., Colton, Cal.; and Southwestern Ornamental Iron Works, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the issuing of stamped and printed envelopes by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., advocating a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.